

September 10, 2009

**OFFICE OF THE HEARING EXAMINER
CITY OF RENTON**

REPORT AND DECISION

APPELLANTS: Brad Nicholson
South End Gives Back (SEGB)
Represented by: Keith Scully

OWNER: Port Quendall Company
Attn: Steve Van Til
505 Union Station, 505 Fifth Ave S., Ste. 900
Seattle, WA 98104

APPLICANT/CONTACT: Spencer Alpert
Alpert International, LLP
10218 Richwood Ave NW
Seattle, WA 98177
Represented by: Jack McCullough
701 5t Avenue, Ste. 7220
Seattle, WA 98104

RESPONDENT: City of Renton
Ann Nielsen, Assistant City Attorney

File No.: LUA 09-060, ECF, SA-M, SA-H

LOCATION: 4350 Lake Washington Blvd North

SUMMARY OF APPEAL AND
LAND USE ACTION: Appeal of SEPA Determination and request for Master Site
Plan Review and Site Plan Review for a 5-story, 60-foot high,
122,000 square foot, 173-room hotel.

PUBLIC HEARING: After reviewing the Appellant's written request for a hearing
and examining available information on file, the Examiner
conducted a public hearing on the subject as follows:

MINUTES

***The following minutes are a summary of the August 25, 2009 hearing.
The legal record is recorded on CD.***

The hearing opened on Tuesday, August 25, 2009, at 9:00 a.m. in the Council Chambers on the seventh floor of the Renton City Hall. Parties wishing to testify were affirmed by the Examiner.

Parties present: Ann Nielsen, Assistant City Attorney representing City of Renton
Vanessa Dolbee, Associate Planner, Development Services

Keith Scully, Attorney representing Appellant Brad Nicholson and SEGB

Jack McCullough and Jessie Clawson, Attorneys representing Alpert International, LLP

The following exhibits were entered into the record for the SEPA Appeal:

<u>Exhibit No. 1:</u> Yellow file, LUA-09-060, ECF, SA-M, SA-H containing the original application, various reports, correspondence file, SEPA documents, SEPA Appeal and Staff analysis.	<u>Exhibit A:</u> Vicinity Map
<u>Exhibit B:</u> Site Plan	<u>Exhibit C:</u> Ask Fred what he wrote down!
<u>Exhibit No. 2:</u> Notice of Appeal with Attachments A-L	<u>Exhibit No. 3:</u> Notice of Supplemental Brief and Attachments
<u>Exhibit No. 4:</u> Larger Overview of Vicinity Map	<u>Exhibit No. 5:</u> Close-up of Vicinity Map
<u>Exhibit D:</u> Existing Condition of Site	<u>Exhibit E:</u> Deconstruction Plan
<u>Exhibit F:</u> Post Deconstruction Plan	<u>Exhibit G:</u> Site Utility Plan
<u>Exhibit H:</u> Grading Plan	<u>Exhibit I:</u> Dan Mitzel Biography
<u>Exhibit J:</u> Sound Design Group LLC	<u>Exhibit K:</u> TIR

The Examiner stated that today the Hawks Landing Land Use, LUA-09-060 hearing for a Master Site Plan and Site Plan Review, and a SEPA Appeal filed by SEGB and Brad Nicholson, who are challenging the SEPA Determination by the City would be heard. The SEPA appeal will be first followed by the Land Use.

The Examiner asked for preliminary remarks:

Ann Nielsen stated that in the submissions by the appellant in the initial notice of appeal, along with their supplemental brief, appellants raised an issue in regards to the Master Site Plan, the City and the applicant did respond to that issue. The Master Site Plan and the Site Plan hearing is separate and apart from the SEPA appeal, those issues raised that pertain to the Master Site Plan and Site Plan should be stricken and barred from the SEPA appeal hearing.

Keith Scully stated that he did not disagree with Ms. Nielsen, his document should have been titled differently in order to separate the two hearings.

It was agreed by all parties to strike the Master Site Plan and Site Plan issues from the SEPA appeal hearing.

Vanessa Dolbee stated that the site is located at 4350 Lake Washington Blvd North and is a 7.8 acre parcel, however the project site is only 3.07 acres in the northern part of Renton in the COR zone just north of May Creek. It is east of Lake Washington Boulevard, and south and west of I-405. The project proposes to build a hotel on the site that would include retail space, a fitness center, a spa and a restaurant. The building would be 60-feet high and 5 stories. It would be a total of 122,000 square feet with 173 rooms and a 124 space surface parking lot in addition to an underground parking garage. The hotel would be located in the northwestern corner of the project.

There are two wetlands associated with May Creek, both are to the north of May Creek. One wetland is 63 feet from the property line where the development will take place. The other one is approximately 117 feet south of the property line of the developed site. The Shoreline Master Program would have different buffers depending on the use, the Shoreline jurisdiction is invoked if development is within 200 feet of May Creek, all the proposed development is outside of that 200 foot area.

Keith Scully, Gendler and Mann asked to submit all the attachments to their Notice of Appeal Hearing Brief and a Notice of Supplemental Evidence. Included within the attachments are Declarations from Dr. Massmann and Mr. Nicholson. They do not need to repeat everything if the Examiner would be willing to accept them in lieu of live testimony. They are present, if there should be cross examination, they would be willing to answer any questions that there may be.

Dr. Joel Massmann, 6520 E Mercer Way, Mercer Island, WA 98040. Upon questioning by Mr. McCullough, Dr. Massmann stated that his declaration represented his comments on this pending application. In paragraph 3 on page 2 where it states that 85% of the impervious surface was taken out of the plans leaving the assumption that there would be a potential for a reduction of 4 acres in impervious surface on this site. His analysis in his declaration was based on that potential. The impervious surface over the larger site, beyond the 3.7 acres is actually less than 85%.

The assumption was that any land that was currently impervious and it became pervious the recharge onto that portion would become ground water. Rain Gardens would also infiltrate at a rate typical of soils in this part of the county.

Upon questioning by Mr. Scully, Dr. Massmann stated that 4 acres of impervious surface could be deconstructed and would then infiltrate at a rate typical of soils in this part of the county. If it would be less than 4 acres you could simply divide that ratio by the actual amount of impervious surface. A Rain Garden is a place to collect surface water runoff and store it to potentially infiltrate the water. There may be less infiltration in a Rain Garden due to the plants that would transpire, they are roughly similar to simple surface water runoff, and there would be less recharge in the Rain Gardens because of evapotranspiration.

Keith Scully stated that Mr. Nicholson was also present and his Declaration was part of the record. If there were no questions for Mr. Nicholson, he would not be called to testify. There were no questions for Mr. Nicholson.

It is their burden to show that there are probable significant adverse environmental impacts that clearly shows that an Environmental Impact Statement should have been ordered, rather than what did happen when the City decided that there were no probable significant adverse environmental impacts.

The point of an EIS is to study the exact impacts. One of those is not available, they cannot tell exactly what will happen should this project be developed. They must show that it is more likely than not that it is probable that something bad is going to happen to the environment if this plan goes forward as designed.

On SEPA, they are resting on one point and that is the stormwater. It rains all the time in Washington, there is a ton of water that any site must deal with. This particular site is 85% impermeable and currently there are some old warehouses and a bunch of pavement. When you have a site like this, and you take away pavement and permeable surface that rain water can simply go through into ground water rather than landing on and flowing off. Usually that is an unmitigated good thing and usually fights over developments like this in that there is not enough ground water recharge, there would be too much water flowing off the site and flowing into water bodies like May Creek or into the drainage ditch that carries the water off the site. This site is unique and SEPA requires looking at not just how most sites would affect the environment but how this particular site impacts the environment.

The goal of SEPA is not to make things slightly better than they used to be, but to create a document that lets the decision maker really understand the environmental impacts of the proposal. The question is, is there going to be a probable significant adverse environmental impact? This is not the case of sample sites described in the Surface Water Design Manual, where more water flowing into the ground is automatically a good thing. Because of where this site is located, there are residential and commercial properties to the south, there are freeways close by, a residential development to the west and close to the site is the Quendall terminal which is loaded with chemicals and toxic soils that move via groundwater to the lake. There are hot spots of environmental contaminants in Lake Washington that have been flushed from the land.

With this project, pavement will be torn out, buildings will be deconstructed, Rain Gardens will be added, which will absorb some of the water but not enough, there will be landscaping added and impervious surfaces will be dug up and replaced with a different impervious surface and permeable surfaces. The rain that currently flows on this site is channeled to a drainage ditch and on to May Creek, more of that is going to be going into the ground than previously. With this new construction, all water will now go directly to the Quendall site and add toxins to Lake Washington. An EIS would tell how much of an impact this new construction would have on existing water flow and Lake Washington.

In order to begin construction on this site, they will need to dig a de-watering trench to drain the site while they use construction equipment. This ground is already saturated, there would be more ground water flow during the construction. They may need to add catch basins in order to flow water to May Creek without more toxins from the surface.

The Appellant is asking for a finding of probably significant adverse environmental impact and asks that this be remanded back for a Determination of Significance and an Environmental Impact Statement.

Ms. Nielsen waived an opening statement, the City will present their information via a presentation by the project manager, Vanessa Dolbee. She will then join with the applicant in any specific presentation with respect to the stormwater issues.

Vanessa Dolbee stated that the City did receive an application from Spencer Alpert of Alpert International, LLP for a SEPA Environmental Review, Master Site Plan and Site Plan Review for the Hawk's Landing Hotel, the applicant did provide all documents required by Renton Code. The SEPA review returned a Determination of Significance – Mitigated with 10 mitigation measures.

The site is vacant, but used to be the home of Pan Abode Cedar Homes. All of the buildings on the site will be deconstructed with the exception of the one building on the south. That building does have a corner within the 200-foot shoreline. The hotel and parking will be located in the northwest corner of the site. Mitigation measures 3 and 4 require the applicant to comply with the 2005 King County Storm Water Design Manual in addition to providing erosion and sediment control per Department of Ecology during construction.

Upon questioning by Mr. Scully, Ms. Dolbee stated that the white space shown on Exhibit G is in general impervious surface. It is old concrete and other buildings as well as other items left on the site.

Discussion was had regarding the materials left on the site, whether the hotel would face those leftover materials. The Examiner inquired as to what was going to happen to the rest of the white space.

Mr. Scully continued stating that in fact, the City does not know what is going to happen with all the stuff remaining on the site.

Ms. Dolbee stated that based on the submittal documents, she believed that the areas not marked "TBR" would not be removed. There is no condition that requires them to leave that area impervious. There also has been no document issued at this point by the City regulating that space outside the development area. A permit would be required to do any type of work on the site. There is nothing in the plans that states what will happen to the soil under the buildings that are to be removed.

Mr. McCullough stated that they would defer any opening statement and called Mr. Mitzel to testify.

Dan Mitzel, 1111 Cleveland Avenue, Mt. Vernon, WA 98273 stated that he was developing this site in conjunction with Spencer Alpert of Alpert International. He is the developer for the hotel and has been active in the real estate business since 1977 and active in the hotel business since 1984. About a year ago he got together with Mr. Alpert and starting discussing possibilities of developing this site for a hotel that would work in conjunction with the Seattle Seahawks. An agreement was entered into with the Seahawks to build a hotel that would be considered the official hotel for the Seattle Seahawks, it was very important that they have a hotel that was within close proximity to the VMAC Center and training center.

Upon questioning by Mr. McCullough, Mr. Mitzel stated that the plan was to remove the buildings, leave the concrete slabs under the buildings and leave the asphalt that surrounds the buildings so that the impervious areas are mimicking the existing conditions in the area outside of where the hotel will occur. There will not be 4 acres of new pervious surface in the area of this new construction. The portion of the site that is impervious will remain very similar to its present condition. There is no plan to change the existing square footage of impervious surface in the area unrelated to the hotel development.

All buildings are sitting on concrete slabs. The hotel that will be built on this site will have some rooms looking to the east and southeast. Those views would be essentially of asphalt and concrete, there might be a minor amount of general cleanup that happens, the site is not a junk yard, rather a series of buildings that will be taken down, the slabs will be left, the asphalt will be left and that will be the condition they must deal with in terms of the view from some of the rooms, it is not perfect or ideal, but neither is looking at the freeway. They feel it is a condition they are willing to live with and they are willing to take that risk.

Upon questioning by Mr. Scully, Mr. Mitzel stated that the entire site is under their control under a real estate purchase and sale agreement. It is one tax parcel. They operate hotels in many different conditions. The premium rooms will be looking at Lake Washington. At this point they have not begun to obtain their demolition permits. There have been no specific conditions about how they leave the area that does not include the project area. Nothing will be removed outside the project area.

Pat Severin, Sound Development Group, LLC, 15214 Avon-Allen Road, Mt. Vernon, WA 98273.

Upon questioning by Mr. McCullough, Mr. Severin identified a statement of qualifications for Sound Development Group. He has been an engineer in the Skagit Valley for 10-12 years and been practicing engineering since 1989 and licensed since 1995.

Mr. Severin was contacted by Mr. Mitzel to provide engineering and surveying services for the project. They addressed storm drainage, utility designs, site layout and grading plans for the site. They worked with the project architect to develop a site plan that was aesthetically pleasing and functions from a utility standpoint. Exhibits E and G are true depictions of the existing conditions and post development conditions of the site.

Rain Gardens have a two-fold function, it is a point of collection for stormwater, it provides water quality treatment and in some cases infiltration to actually dispose of stormwater runoff. This site is only using Rain Gardens for the treatment of the water, they do not intend to infiltrate any water in the Rain Garden area. The TIR for this project contained a diagram of the Rain Garden Treatment System. After the water was collected

in the Rain Garden it flows into the drainage system and out to May Creek where it currently discharges. There would be a collection pipe at the bottom of the Rain Garden to receive all the surface water that percolates through the Rain Garden down to the drain rock below. The bottom of the Rain Garden would be lined. Per the King County Manual, they are required to treat pollution generating impervious surfaces, which is primarily asphalt and some concrete surfaces and that is what they are collecting. Roof waters are typically considered not a pollution generating impervious surface, that water will be collected and diverted to the ditch in a separate system.

Per the King County Manual, impervious surfaces are actually considered asphalt, concrete and typically graveled surfaces, even if it were all to be removed, which the applicant does not intend to do, it would still be considered impervious. Pre-development to post-development, all the water would be discharged to the ditch much as it is today. The only difference is that they are treating the stormwater runoff and the Rain Garden will provide some flow attenuation from stormwater. They are providing a better water quality than what is there today.

Upon questioning by Mr. Scully, Mr. Severin stated that there was no water evaluation on the undeveloped portion of the site other than knowing from the grades in the standpoint that the water would continue to flow like it has done previously into the ditch. He only addressed what they currently were developing. The site slopes more from the east to the west. The area outside of the hotel generally flows to the west and Lake Washington Blvd. and it will continue to flow that way.

In the Water Quality Manual there are several menus, there is one that determines if it is a high or low use site, which is generated by average daily use traffic. This site was determined to be low volume traffic therefore, they were required to do basic water quality treatment. They chose Rain Gardens because it is a very attractive technology that is available and is promoted by a lot of the jurisdictions. There are many ways to provide basic treatment, the Rain Garden treatment actually qualifies for enhanced treatment and it does a better job of cleaning the water.

Mr. McCullough stated that they have addressed the legal arguments in the briefing submitted earlier and it remains their view that the burden that the appellants face in the SEPA appeal is a burden under the applicable case law of actually producing evidence. That has not been seen today, the only evidence that has been submitted is the Declaration of Dr. Massmann and he testified here that he clearly made two fundamental assumptions to reach the conclusion that he did: 1. Four acres of the larger site would be converted from impervious to pervious surface and 2. He assumed the Rain Garden feature would be a stormwater element that would provide for the infiltration of stormwater.

It has been clarified in their response/presentation that both those assumptions are absolutely inaccurate. There will be no conversion of impervious to pervious as a result of the deconstruction and the Rain Garden is a water quality treatment feature. There is no likelihood of any increased infiltration of any material amount in this ground. There is no evidence in support of this SEPA appeal. Any change would be subject to review and there are no plans to change the impervious surfaces. The appellant has failed in their burden to show error and therefore asks the Examiner to uphold the SEPA Determination.

Ann Nielsen stated that the applicant more than complied with all the necessary application materials and documents in his request for a SEPA review to the ERC. The ERC had all the necessary information before them that they needed to make an adequate SEPA assessment, in doing so they came to a DSN-M with specific mitigation measures. The Appellant has done nothing to show that there was any significant adverse environmental impact that was not contemplated or could not be mitigated by the conditions that were put upon by the ERC committee. The City would request that the Examiner find that the appellant has failed in their burden to show clear error and that the SEPA determination should be upheld.

Mr. Scully stated that the specific evidence they have pointed out is what happens if you do remove all the structures and impervious surfaces. They learned today on the record that they are not going to be doing that. That is not a condition of mitigation and not a part of their application.

Contrary to what Mr. McCullough said the fact that it is in the record in front of the Examiner means nothing for the future. The fact that they said they were not going to do it, does not bind them from proceeding with separate projects. It does not prevent them from getting a separate permit, it also does not prevent them from doing things that do not require a permit. There is a glaring omission on what is going to happen on the majority of the site. At a minimum they ask that the Examiner require a mitigation condition that what is currently impervious outside the development area should remain impervious. Today there is not enough information as to what is going to happen to the rest of the site and an EIS should be required.

The Examiner stated that if by imposing an additional condition the parties would agree to retract their appeal that is something that the Examiner is entitled to do. By taking the appellant's concerns under advisement and the applicant's willingness at this point to say they are not going to do any of that action without permitting of the City.

A 10 minute Break was taken

LAND USE HEARING began at 10:49 am

The following exhibits were entered into the record for the Hawk's Landing Land Use Hearing:

<u>Exhibit No. 1:</u> Yellow file, LUA-09-064, ECF, SA-M, SA-H containing the original application, various reports, correspondence file, SEPA documents, SEPA Appeal and Staff analysis.	<u>Exhibit No. 2:</u> Neighborhood Detail Map
<u>Exhibit No. 3:</u> Existing Conditions	<u>Exhibit No. 4:</u> Hawk's Landing Master Site Plan
<u>Exhibit No. 5:</u> Hawk's Landing Site Plan	<u>Exhibit No. 6:</u> Site Dimension Plan
<u>Exhibit No. 7:</u> Tree Inventory Plan	<u>Exhibit No. 8:</u> Landscape Plan
<u>Exhibit No. 9:</u> Site Utility Plan	<u>Exhibit No. 10:</u> Grading Plan
<u>Exhibit No. 11:</u> East and South Exterior Elevations	<u>Exhibit No. 12:</u> West and North Exterior Elevations
<u>Exhibit No. 13:</u> S & E Elevations (graphic)	<u>Exhibit No. 14:</u> N & W Elevations (graphic)
<u>Exhibit No. 15:</u> Hotel Garage Floor Plan	<u>Exhibit No. 16:</u> First Floor Plan
<u>Exhibit No. 17:</u> Second Floor Plan	<u>Exhibit No. 18:</u> Third and Fourth Floor Plans
<u>Exhibit No. 19:</u> Fifth Floor Plan	<u>Exhibit No. 20:</u> Roof Plan
<u>Exhibit No. 21:</u> Building Sections	<u>Exhibit No. 22:</u> Demolition Plan

<u>Exhibit No. 23:</u> All Exhibits entered during the SEPA Appeal for the Hawk's Landing Hotel	<u>Exhibit No. 24:</u> Reinart Statement of Qualifications
<u>Exhibit No. 25:</u> Traffic Impact Analysis dated 5/2009	<u>Exhibit No. 26:</u> Pat Bunting Qualifications
<u>Exhibit No. 27:</u> Wetlands Report	<u>Exhibit No. 28:</u> Mel Maertz Qualifications
<u>Exhibit No. 29:</u> Detail map showing hotel site to VMAC location	<u>Exhibit No. 30:</u> Map showing the area around the proposed site from WSDOT plans for I-405

The hearing continued on Tuesday, August 25, 2009, at 10:49 a.m. in the Council Chambers on the seventh floor of the Renton City Hall. This portion is the hearing of the Hawk's Landing Mixed Use Master Site Plan Review and Site Plan Review. Parties wishing to testify were affirmed by the Examiner. The Examiner did ask for additional time in preparing his decision due to the length of the material presented.

Vanessa Dolbee stated that she is the project manager for the Hawk's Landing Hotel for the City of Renton. The applicant has requested a Master Site Plan and Site Plan Review.

The City of Renton did receive some Capital Improvement Funds during the 2009 Legislative Session; Staff is currently working to identify how those will be expended, although it has to be approved by City Council, which has not approved the expenditures at this time. Some of the items on the table that do have a direct relationship to this project would be a water line extension on Lake Washington Blvd and the extension of a trail along May Creek and some storm drainage improvements along Lake Washington Blvd that may include some impervious sidewalk improvements. Review and permitting of this would happen at a separate time.

The site is located at 4350 Lake Washington Blvd N, the former site of Pan Abode Cedar Homes, to the northwest is VMAC, the home of The Seahawks, to the west are Barbee Mill and Quendall Terminal and to the south is May Creek. The parcel is 7.88 acres in size and the project area is 3.07 acres. There is a small triangular parcel of land at the far north end of the site which is currently owned by the City of Renton. A vacation request has been made by the applicant to acquire that parcel under file #VAC-09-001. It has been approved with some conditions associated with the approval.

The hotel is proposed to be 60-feet tall with 5 stories, 122,000 square feet with 173 rooms, with retail space, fitness center, spa, conference space, banquet facilities and a restaurant. Access to the site would be from Lake Washington Blvd via two locations; first is north located in the existing vacation area, which with approval would become a part of this parcel and would be limited to right-in/right-out only, the second access is to the center of the larger parcel and would provide access from both directions. There would be parking in an underground garage as well as surface parking, with 231 parking stalls total, 107 in the garage and 124 surface stalls.

This project is in compliance with the comprehensive plan, its elements, goals, objectives and policies. Lot coverage for the COR zone is 65%, the building footprint has a 22% coverage. Setbacks for the COR zone are determined through the site plan review, the applicant has proposed a 20-foot front setback from Lake Washington Blvd, a 60-foot setback from the north side of the property line, a 480-foot south setback and a 129-foot setback from the rear property line along I-405.

The COR zone requires portions of the building which exceed 50-feet in height would include upper story setbacks at a minimum of 10-feet from the preceding story, the building should include vertical and horizontal modulation on roof lines and facades at a minimum of two feet and an interval minimum of 40 feet. The fifth

story of this hotel would be subject to these requirements. The proposed architectural design meets the intent of the special development standard.

The landscaping is determined through site plan review, perimeter landscaping has been proposed in widths from 6-feet to 25-feet, screening around the refuse and recycling areas, ornamental landscaping at the hotel entrance with a Koi pond and a pedestrian bridge crossing. Street trees would be planted along Lake Washington Blvd. This landscape plan further complies with the City's parking regulations. There are no specific standards for landscaping refuse and recycling for hotel developments.

This proposal would improve the character of the site, new access would be provided and street frontage improvements provided. Landscaping would be provided that would screen the surface parking area from surrounding properties. The scale of the structure is larger than the Barbee Mill but smaller than the VMAC. This hotel does provide a much needed transition from the existing residential and I-405. The hotel would be more compatible with the surrounding residential than the former industrial site and the impacts to the surrounding properties and uses are expected to be minimal. The scale, height and bulk of the proposed buildings are appropriate for the site and would be compatible with surrounding properties. If and when the remainder of the site is developed, it would need to be compatible with the hotel. The proposal is expected to increase property values in the vicinity of the site.

In addition to access and parking on the site, pedestrian connections to the public sidewalks are proposed along the street frontage which would provide safe pedestrian access throughout the site. The applicant would be required to provide a 12-foot sidewalk along the frontage of Lake Washington Blvd with a 10-foot landscaping strip for safety. The single building would not have an impact on the site's light and air circulation. There would be minimal noise impacts from the increased traffic, although the noise would be virtually unnoticeable because of the proximity of I-405.

The Fire and Police Departments for the City of Renton have indicated that their existing facilities are adequate to accommodate the subject proposal. Impact fees have been required as a mitigation measure of the SEPA. Redevelopment of this site would help prevent deterioration and blight of the neighborhood. It would actually increase the quality of the subject site and the project is expected to contribute to the well-being of the City in general and the neighborhood in particular.

This site is located in Design District C, which is an overlay design district and it is in compliance with most of the requirements of the Design District, except for the following:

The west elevation of the building has some blank walls and Staff has requested that the west side be re-designed at that portion to feature a pedestrian oriented façade.

Design District requires that all sides and top of refuse and recycling areas be enclosed. Having a top enclosure would not function well with garbage collection, they have asked for a modification to not put a top on the enclosure.

The proposed surface parking lot is not intended to be built into a structured parking at future phases of potential development. This site is constrained by access off of one road and the internal circulation of the site is vital for future potential development and this parking lot would serve as that internal vehicular circulation.

The applicant should submit new site plans indicating the entire pedestrian pathway throughout the parking lot as differentiating materials or texture from the adjacent paving.

The applicants have proposed to provide canopies along the façade fronting Lake Washington Blvd that exceed the minimum width standards, although they do not meet the minimum length standards they have proposed them along 38.5% of the façade, which pertains to approximately 60 linear feet. The hotel design also provides modulation as it fronts Lake Washington Blvd, some portions of the hotel are set back and not immediately adjacent to the sidewalk. As such, the design requirement of the overhangs would not be achieving their goal in some of those areas, therefore the 60-feet of linear canopy coverage.

There are some additional requirements if the project is located in the COR zone, which this proposed project meets.

Hearing was adjourned for lunch at 11:30 am...

Back on record at 1:00 pm

Pat Severin, 15214 Avon-Allen Road, Mt. Vernon, WA 98273 stated that they had taken a look at the site with the existing conditions and constraints from elevations in the roadways and they came up with a grading plan that actually would grade the entire site towards the surface areas of the Rain Gardens from the entrance road and from all the parking areas towards the Rain Gardens. All this water would be collected in the Rain Gardens, treated, and conveyed to the discharge point down through the bottom of the ditch. Any of the water around the hotel would be picked up with downspouts and/or yard area drains directed to the same discharge location.

He did not believe that any flow control would be required on this site per an exemption in the King County Manual. Some flow attenuation would happen with the Rain Garden. They do not have an approved construction document at this time, it is only a planning document.

The next step would be to receive site plan approval and then proceed with the construction documents where they would finalize their design depending on comments from the City Staff. The Rain Gardens have not been approved as a design feature and in fact when the approval comes through it might not include Rain Gardens but some other feature. There are a number of features that would provide the same level of treatment to choose from. The final plan would need to comply with the City's Code.

This 3.07 acre site is not within the 100 year flood plain, a portion of the south boundary just crosses the 100 year flood plain.

Geralyn Reinart, PE, 159 Denny Way #111, Seattle, WA 98109 stated she is a self employed traffic engineering consultant specializing in the preparation of Traffic Impact Analyses. She was responsible for the preparation of the Traffic Impact Analysis for this project. The analysis included a review of the existing conditions adjacent to the project including the operations of three intersections along NE 44th, the northbound and southbound ramps to I-405, along with the Seahawks Way intersection. This included a review of the number of accidents along Lake Washington Blvd and NE 44th Street. AM and PM peak hour traffic counts completed for the project were also used in the analysis, along with a review of the site accesses at two locations along Lake Washington Blvd.

Looking at the site accesses, the existing Pan Abode driveway should be limited to right turns in and out due to its close location to the ramp interchange. The main access to the site is located towards the southerly end of the hotel portion of the property. In looking at the future volumes at that intersection left turns into the site were recommended. Build out of the hotel could generate over 1400 daily trips, 97 during the AM peak hour and 102 during the PM peak hour per the Institute of Transportation Engineer's Trip Generation Manual. The future trip

volume projections at the intersections mentioned earlier included pipeline trips from the adjacent Barbee Mill development that is ongoing currently plus a 2% annual growth rate in the traffic volumes, which is consistent with prior studies that have been completed in the area. The project trips were added into the future values to analyze the impacts from the project itself. The trip assignment for the hotel was based on prior work that was done in the vicinity and specifically the Port Quendall analysis of the I-405/NE 44th Street interchange project access report prepared by WSDOT. There were some adjustments made to that report since this road was going to be serving Seahawks visitors, some of that traffic was redistributed up to the Seahawks facility. The critical movement at the intersection of Seahawks Way and Lake Washington Blvd near the northerly access to the site is currently moving at Level Service D during the peak hours. Future increases would drop that level of service to E with or without the hotel. The other critical intersection operations would be the north and southbound ramps to I-405, some of the movements are operating at Level Service F during the AM peak hour and the delay on those movements would continue to increase over the next few years with or without the hotel project. All of these intersections are within the WSDOT limited access area, they are also subject to review as part of this project.

Measures to raise the level of service at these intersections was reviewed by both agencies and included the installation of traffic signals for the ramps and then some restriping of lanes and construction involved with lane additions. WSDOT did concur with these measures and requesting that the applicant participate in a proportionate share of the cost of these improvements, which are being proposed by WSDOT.

Pat Bunting, 3643 Leg Road, Bow, WA 98232 stated that her firm, Graham and Bunting, is an environmental and land use service. She was one of three on the project team that was assigned to go to the site and look for critical areas that could possibly be anywhere from the site down to May Creek. They found two small wetlands off site by May Creek, they are Category 2 wetlands. There was May Creek, a Class 1 stream, there is also a ditch alongside Lake Washington Blvd which is a Class 5 stream. The hotel would be more than 200 feet from May Creek. The small wetlands were offsite and so are not buffered, they are well out of the range of the project site. Checking the habitat of the stream requires walking up and down the stream banks and looking for habitat including large debris, downed logs, vegetation, ripples and pools places where fish can spawn and feed, they looked at the classified ditch as well for that reason. May Creek is a habitat for fish.

The wetlands were so small, their habitat value was found to be over winter when there would be water, and there might be some winter habitat. But there was not much there, the wetlands were not even wet at this time of year. Each one is less than 500 square feet.

This project, as proposed, meets all requirements for the City of Renton.

Mel Maertz, 16921 Larch Way, Lynnwood, WA 98037 gave a brief description of his qualifications. His role in this project was to help programming and master planning of the project. He worked on the design of the hotel. The site plan for the hotel is oriented to Lake Washington, taking advantage of the views, they planned this hotel so it would not affect the future development of the remainder of the site. They tried to accommodate the pedestrians and the traffic, it was important to look at the Seahawks facility and the connectivity between the two facilities. Parking to the back and easy access to the underground parking were very important.

The hotel was designed with a Northwest Craftsman look and incorporated materials like those used in the Seahawks facility as well as the Barbee Mill community across the street. They are trying to create a sustainable building that would be a leader in the community.

Vanessa Dolbee responded to an earlier question by the Examiner regarding refuse and recycling. Renton Municipal Code requires for multi-family developments one and a half square feet per dwelling unit and three square feet for recycling and three square feet per dwelling unit for refuse. The office analysis was based on two square feet per 1000 gross building square feet for recycling and four square feet for refuse for 1000 gross

building square feet, which results in for recycling the 244 square feet and refuse at 488 for the office requirement. Looking at the multi-family requirements the recycling (hotel rooms as dwelling units) 259.5 square feet for recycling and 519 square feet for refuse, which is actually an increase from the office calculations.

Keith Scully, Attorney representing Brad Nicholson 1424 4th Ave, Ste. 1015, Seattle, WA 98103 stated that they had submitted some written comments as part of the Notice of Appeal. They learned a fair amount today and so would modify some of those comments. There are some greater concerns but also some reduced concerns with the Shoreline Substantial Development Permit.

A drainage plan is required under Renton Municipal Code as part of a Master Site Plan or Site Plan application. There is an exception to that requirement which allows the City to make a determination that if the proposal will not substantially alter the drainage pattern and/or it will not adversely affect the drainage pattern, then the City can waive that requirement. There has been no formal request for that and no formal waiver made and based on what they learned today that waiver is not applicable. This proposal does substantially alter the drainage pattern. They are going to grade the entirety of the site and route it into the Rain Garden. Currently water flows into the creek, this will adversely impact water quality because of flowing over what is undeveloped impervious surface, and it will be flowing over an active parking lot.

The Drainage plan is a document that is reviewed by the Examiner and determines if what is proposed is compliant with Renton's code and with Renton's incorporation with the King County Surface Water Design Manual. What you have is a conceptual outline of what they might ask the City to approve as part of their building permit. This does not comply with the King County Surface Water Design Manual. There is nothing for the Examiner to rule on, they don't know if they are going to be doing the Rain Garden plan or something else. They are planning to deal with flow control and toxin removal through a Rain Garden treatment system, although they disagree with them, however they do admit that they need to do something to control the toxins that will come off the parking lot. A Rain Garden would be okay for this proposal, but what they have called a Rain Garden, includes an impermeable surface layer. A Rain Garden is something that has plants in it and lets water infiltrate the ground. There is an infiltration component to every single Rain Garden design, this impervious liner makes this not a Rain Garden. The water that is flowing off the parking lot now flows through a little bit of gravel into a pipe and straight to May Creek. What they are actually proposing is a thing called a perforated pipe collection system, which is a box with some gravel in it and a pipe at the bottom. There are no flow control credits for it, and that is because it does not work as a pollution control plan.

He disagreed with the comments made by the wetlands specialist that you don't buffer something off site. If the property line stops and there are no critters on your property, you are done with the evaluation. The habitat and the impacts on the habitat should be studied, not just the impacts on your property. There are fish in the creek, birdlife in the vegetation, and all the stuff that comes with a small conservancy designated wetland. The hotel is far from the wetlands, but the blank space is unknown at this point. What do they intend to do with it? It appears that it is currently being used as overflow parking for the Seahawk's games, is it going to be lit with the lights shining on what may be song bird nesting habitat, what is the flow going to be like when cars are parking on it, are they going to be putting heavy equipment on it for some later project. No one knows what is going to happen.

They have less of a concern on the Shoreline Substantial Development Permit. If any part of this one project goes within 200 feet of May Creek, a Shoreline Substantial Development Permit is needed. They have been told today that no part of this development will be within 200 feet of May Creek. If the south building is left untouched and no work done in that area, then they do not need a SSDP. They would ask for a special condition to be added that no work incur in that area within 200 feet of May Creek.

Kayren Kittrick, Dev Engineering Supervisor, Community and Economic Development showed a map of the project site, she marked the site with an "X". Directly across to the northwest is the entrance of Seahawk Way and the VMAC building, it further showed the location of Barbee Mill development. This development has triggered improvements to the intersections including stop lights.

The start of a LUA file is only preliminary discussions, included in those preliminary discussions is a preliminary drainage plan, it is required. The final construction plans takes in things brought in during the hearing, things added as conditions, best management practices plus changes they find on the site during construction. The Rain Garden design is very interesting, it seems closer to a bioswale design and that is one of the acceptable items. It will have to be studied to see if it works, if it does not, the applicant must find another method that is acceptable within the King County Surface Water Design Manual. The hotel and hotel parking could change anything that might affect the final calculations of what they have to treat and what has to be released. The standards are not relaxed, a preliminary design is presented, and that is what we know at this point based on specific calculations. Conditions can be made, ERC could have made a condition, plus once it gets looked into and they find it does not meet the King County Surface Water Design conditions or standards or doesn't do what they think it is going to do, the City runs their own calculations and checks on everything. Even under an EIS it is still a preliminary design subject to change.

Any soils that are removed from this site would be checked for contamination and treated as deemed necessary.

Vanessa Dolbee stated that Mr. Scully had been referring to a habitat management plan, the City code does not specify a habitat management plan, and they have a habitat assessment and a habitat data report. The habitat data report was waived (which is the same thing as the habitat assessment). It was waived because there was a Fish and Wildlife habitat section within the wetland and stream study that provided sufficient information to the City to determine that the habitat assessment report could be waived.

Keith Scully stated that he believed that Renton's policy is to allow a preliminary drainage plan but that is wrong and now seems like the time to fix it. RMC 4-60-030C says that persons applying for specific permits or approvals would submit for approval a drainage plan for their application or request. Further on, drainage plan is defined in the same section 4-60-030F stating that the drainage plan will be prepared in conformance with the department's construction plan drafting standards and contents and the design criteria contained in chapters 3, 4, and 5 of the current King County Surface Water Design Manual. Nothing in the code section about the start of a conversation or a preliminary plan, which means the final thing and they need to make a determination that it does or doesn't that the Hearing Examiner can then repeal.

Jack McCullough stated that the only lingering issues have to do with the drainage plan. The testimony from Mr. Severin and the City stated that a drainage plan was submitted. The confusion here is that the comments from Mr. Scully on behalf of his client suggest that it is the Examiner's position in this proceeding to pass judgment on approved drainage plan. That is not the case. Sub-section G of the Code section referenced by Mr. Scully, Review and Approval of Plan, it indicates that the decision on the plan is reserved to the approval of the Development Services Division. In the second sentence of sub-section G1, it says that if no action is taken by the City after submission of the Final Drainage Plans within 45 days, then such plan is deemed approved. In Sub-section G3 it indicates under additional information that the permit application shall be supplemented by any plans, specifications or other information considered pertinent in the judgment of the Administrator or his duly authorized representative. This is the process that Ms. Kittrick outlined, there is an additional submittal, it's not just a conversation, a report has been issued showing the process and treatment that is anticipated to take place. At this point it is incumbent on the Examiner in review of this information only to determine that the plan, in its current state, is feasible on the property. What has been heard from Ms. Kittrick and Mr. Severin is that there will be comments and they have not passed judgment on the acceptability under the manual or the City's Code. Mr. Severin testified that there are alternates that can easily be employed that qualify under the

manual. Once the process of comment is completed then you arrive at what G1 refers to as the Final Drainage Plan. Then the Administrator has 45 days to take final action.

The **Examiner** called for further testimony regarding this project. There was no one else wishing to speak, and no further comments from staff. The hearing closed at 2:07 p.m.

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATION ON SEPA APPEAL:

Having reviewed the record in this matter, the Examiner now makes and enters the following:

FINDINGS:

1. The appellants, South End Gives Back (aka SEGB) and Brad Nicholson, filed an appeal of a Determination of Non-Significance –Mitigated (DNS-M) that the City issued for the proposed Hawk's Landing Hotel. The appellants filed the appeal in a timely manner.
2. The applicant, Spencer Alpert, hereinafter applicant, applied for a Master Site Plan and a Site Plan review for a hotel complex that would include a 173 room hotel, retail space, a fitness center, spa and restaurant. The project would be developed on an approximately 3.07 acre portion of a larger 7.8 acre site located at 4350 Lake Washington Boulevard. The project also includes a proposed "rain garden" which is designed to handle stormwater collected on the subject site.
3. The subject site is located between Lake Washington Boulevard on the west and I-405 on the east and is almost directly south of the on-ramp for I-405 at NE 44th Street.
4. Lake Washington itself is located west of the subject site separated from the subject site by Lake Washington Boulevard, the Barbee Mill subdivision and the Quendall Terminals site. The new Seahawk's Training Center (Virginia Mason Athletic Center) is located a bit further north. May Creek and associated wetlands are located south of the subject site.
5. The subject site was the location of the Pan Abode Cedar Homes manufacturing site. The site is developed with old, now vacant warehouses and almost the entire site is covered with pavement. There are approximately 75,214 square feet of warehouses and impervious surface covers approximately 85% of the subject site.
6. The applicant will be removing pavement and warehouses, "deconstructing" in terms used by the parties, from the north portion of the subject site, the approximately 3.07 acres that will be developed with the hotel and associated surface parking and landscaping.
7. May Creek and Lake Washington are both shorelines of the State and are both subject to the criteria of the Shoreline Master Program. The applicant has designed their demolition and redevelopment proposal to avoid any work within the 200 foot threshold of the Shoreline Master Program
8. The ERC imposed ten (10) conditions. Four of those conditions related to geotechnical issues, wetland/stream issues, in compliance with the 2005 King County Surface Water Design Manual, and erosion control under Department of Ecology regulations. Those four conditions are:
 1. The applicant shall comply with the recommendations found in the following geotechnical reports: "Geotechnical Engineering Study" prepared by Earth Consultants, Inc. dated February 6, 1991;

"Geotechnical Investigation – Draft Report" prepared by Materials Testing & Consulting, Inc. dated June 4, 2009; and "Subsurface Exploration and Geotechnical Engineering Study – Proposed May Creek Office Building", prepared by Hart Crowser & Associates, Inc., dated October 8, 1985.

2. The applicant shall be required to comply with the recommendations included in the "Wetland/Stream Study", prepared by Graham-Bunting Associates, dated May 12, 2009.
3. This project shall be required to comply with the requirements found in the 2005 King County Surface Water Design Manual.
4. The applicant shall be required to provide a Temporary Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (TESCP) designed pursuant to the Department of Ecology's Erosion and Sediment Control Requirements outlined in Volume II of the Stormwater Management Manual prior to issuance of Construction Permits. This condition shall be subject to the review and approval of the Development Services Division Plan Review Project Manager. "
9. The appellant calculates that if there is 85% impervious surface that subject site will generate storm water in the amounts of 10 to 20 acre feet of water or between 900 and 1800 gallons per day. Based on the applicant's submissions the appellant calculates that there will be approximately 38,866 square feet of landscaping. They also calculated the change in impervious surfaces. From those calculations the appellants deduce that "a reduction in impervious surface would dramatically increase the rate of groundwater recharge." (Appeal page 3)
10. The appellants then explain that based on topography, measured groundwater at the site, and hydrogeologic conditions inferred from well logs and test pits, and known lake levels that groundwater will flow to the west, down and toward Lake Washington through the Quendall Terminals site. Since these groundwaters are inferred to flow toward the Quendall Terminals property the appellants anticipate that these groundwaters will pick up or increase the rate of contaminant discharge from Quendall to Lake Washington. The appellants allege contaminants entering the lake will have a deleterious impact on fish and people who use the lake.
11. Quendall Terminals is a Superfund site. That means it has been found to be significantly contaminated and is listed by the Federal Government due to the levels and nature of the contaminants found at the site. Past practices on the site released or produced dangerous hydrocarbons and toxic materials such as arsenic as part of the creosote and tar manufacturing and pole treatments produced on the site.
12. The appellants noted that "rain gardens are 'excavated or otherwise formed depressions in the landscape that provide storage, treatment, and infiltration of stormwater runoff. The soil in the depression is enhanced to promote infiltration and plant growth.'" (Notice of Appeal, Page 2). Relying on the definitions found in the 2005 King County Manual, the manual referenced by the ERC to govern stormwater management on the subject site.
13. In summary the gist of the appellants' arguments are that the applicant will be using the rain garden and or other aspects of the proposal to infiltrate stormwater into the soils under the subject site. This will recharge or supplement the groundwater which will flow toward the west and the Quendall Terminals Superfund site. This will increase the contaminants leaching to Lake Washington from beneath the Quendall site. The toxics in turn will affect the health and safety of the lake for both humans and fish and animal populations.
14. The appellants base much of the appeal on the declaration of Joel Massmann in particular, the following paragraphs:

"7. A reduction in impervious surface would increase groundwater recharge at the project site. Based on typical rates of groundwater recharge in similar hydrogeologic environments, groundwater recharge may increase by approximately 1 to 2 acre-feet per year for each acre of impervious surface that is deconstructed. This is equivalent to an average runoff of 900 to 1,800 gallons per day for each acre of impervious surface that is deconstructed.

8. The estimated increase in groundwater recharge at the project site as a result of the proposed project is approximately 4 to 8 acre-feet per year (3,570 to 7,140 gallons per day). This estimate was developed assuming 4 acres of impervious surface could be deconstructed as part of the proposed development.

11. Increased groundwater recharge on the project site will likely increase the rate of contaminant discharge from the Quendall Terminals site of Lake Washington. This conclusion is based on the observed distribution of contamination beneath the Quendall Terminal site and on the inferred groundwater flow direction from the project site." (Declaration of Joel Massmann)

15. The applicant's submissions and testimony indicate that the feature called a "rain garden" will be installed. The applicant's "rain garden" is designed as a water collection system which captures and treats stormwater collected on the subject site and then conveys it to the same drainage ditch that has been conveying stormwater from the site in the past. Therefore, even if the above numbers are correct, the fact that the applicant proposes capturing most of the stormwater and conveying it to the existing ditch and then into May Creek, makes the numbers and probably the conclusions of the Massmann declaration inconsequential. If much of the stormwater is captured then it will not be entering or recharging the groundwater and will not exacerbate leaching of contaminants into the lake from the Quendall site.
16. There was some confusion or disagreement over whether the applicant's proposed rain garden installation would function to cleanse or treat pollutants. It may not meet the normal definitions for a "rain garden." If a review shows the proposed design is not suitable for its intended purpose than it should not be used. The applicant is still bound by the 2005 King County manual for detention, retention and treatment.

The appellants also attempted to appeal the Master Site Plan as part of their original submission. There was no Master Site Plan decision issued when the appeal was filed. As a matter of fact, one of the land use decisions for which the SEPA appeal was filed was for a review of the Master Site Plan by the Hearing Examiner.

CONCLUSIONS:

1. The decision of the governmental agency acting as the responsible official is entitled to substantial weight. Therefore, the determination of the Environmental Review Committee (ERC), the city's responsible official, is entitled to be maintained unless the appellant clearly demonstrates that the determination was in error. The appellant has failed to demonstrate error.
2. The Determination of Non-Significance in this case is entitled to substantial weight and will not be reversed or modified unless it can be found that the decision is "clearly erroneous." (Hayden v. Port Townsend, 93 Wn 2d 870, 880; 1980). The court in citing Norway Hill Preservation and Protection Association v. King County Council, 87 Wn 2d 267, 274; 1976, stated: "A finding is 'clearly erroneous'

when although there is evidence to support it, the reviewing court on the entire evidence is left with the definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed."

Therefore, the determination of the ERC will not be modified or reversed if it can meet the above test. For reasons enumerated below, the decision of the ERC is affirmed.

3. The clearly erroneous test has generally been applied when an action results in a DNS since the test is less demanding on the appellant. The reason is that SEPA requires a thorough examination of the environmental consequences of an action. The courts have, therefore, made it easier to reverse a DNS. A second test, the "arbitrary and capricious" test is generally applied when a determination of significance (DS) is issued. In this second test an appellant would have to show that the decision clearly flies in the face of reason since a DS is more protective of the environment since it results in the preparation of a full disclosure document, an Environmental Impact Statement.
4. An action is determined to have a significant adverse impact on the quality of the environment if more than a moderate impact on the quality of the environment is a reasonable probability. (Norway, at 278). Since the Court spoke in Norway, WAC 197-11-794 has been adopted, it defines "significant" as follows:

Significant. (1) "Significant" as used in SEPA means a reasonable likelihood of more than a moderate adverse impact on environmental quality.

(2) Significance involves context and intensity ...Intensity depends on the magnitude and duration of an impact.... The severity of the impact should be weighed along with the likelihood of its occurrence. An impact may be significant if its chance of occurrence is not great, but the resulting environmental impact would be severe if it occurred.

5. Also redefined since the Norway decision was the term "probable."

Probable. "Probable" means likely or reasonably likely to occur, ... Probable is used to distinguish likely impacts from those that merely have a possibility of occurring, but are remote or speculative. (WAC 197-11-782).

6. The appellant did not provide a basis that could be used to reverse the City's determination. The proposal will undoubtedly create impacts to the community but they are not substantial, at least, not on the issues the appellants have raised. The appellants have failed to demonstrate that the ERC made a mistake. The applicant will be capturing stormwater water and conveying it in a manner similar to how it was previously conveyed from the subject site. Water will be directed to a rain garden and then be conveyed to the drainage ditch along the west side of the subject site. The water will be treated in the rain garden and while the phrase "rain garden" may not have its normal meaning, infiltration will not follow treatment. The stormwater will be collected, channeled and conveyed to the offsite drainage ditch. It will not be left to percolate into the underlying soils. It will not travel the downhill gradient toward and to Lake Washington. It will not exacerbate pollutants leaching from the contaminated soils into the lake. The post development groundwater quantities suggested by the appellants' evidence is unsupported by the facts. The ERC did not err in its review.
7. The reviewing body has to determine if this proposal would have more than a moderate impact on the quality of the environment. This office is not left with any doubt about the reasonableness of the underlying decision. The appellants have not provided evidence that the ERC erred. The decision

below is not clearly erroneous and the decision below should be affirmed.

8. The appealing party has a burden that was not met in the instant case. The decision of the ERC must be affirmed.

DECISION:

The decision of the ERC is affirmed.

MASTER SITE PLAN AND SITE PLAN REVIEW

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATION:

Having reviewed the record in this matter, the Examiner now makes and enters the following:

FINDINGS:

1. The applicant, Spencer Alpert, filed a request for a Master Plan Review and Site Plan Review.
2. The yellow file containing the staff report, the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) documentation and other pertinent materials was entered into the record as Exhibit #1.
3. The Environmental Review Committee (ERC), the City's responsible official issued a Determination of Non-Significance - Mitigated (DNS-M).
4. The subject proposal was reviewed by all departments with an interest in the matter.
5. The subject site is located 4350 Lake Washington Boulevard North. The subject site is the vacated Pan Abode factory site located on the east side of Lake Washington Boulevard. I-405 is east of the site and its NE 44th Street access ramps are located north of the subject site.
6. The map element of the Comprehensive Plan designates the area in which the subject site is located as suitable for the development of commercial, office and residential uses, but does not mandate such development without consideration of other policies of the Plan.
7. The subject site is currently zoned COR (Commercial, Office, Residential). In addition to being located in the COR Zone, the subject site is governed by the Urban Design District "C" overlay regulations. The COR requirements also require all development to undergo both Master Plan and Site Plan review. The Master Plan review is an overview of a project to determine the overall project concept and how the project meets the City's goals.
8. The subject site was annexed to the City with the adoption of Ordinance 1804 enacted in December 1959.
9. The applicant proposes developing approximately 3.07 acres of an approximately 7.8 acre site. The subject site is generally trapazoidal in shape. The south property line is approximately 732 feet (east to west). The western, Lake Washington Blvd frontage is approximately 800 feet long. The eastern and northeast property lines together are approximately 900 feet long. At the north end of what appears to be part of the parcel is City of Renton property abutting the I-405 ramps. The applicant has requested a vacation of this property.

10. The south portion of the subject site contains regulated slopes, seismic hazards and flood hazards. The applicant proposes an estimated 4,450 cubic yards of cut and approximately 15,000 cubic yards of fill for construction.
11. May Creek, a Class 1 shoreline of the state, and at least two associated wetlands are located south of the subject site. Any development within 200 feet of May Creek would be subject to the Shorelines Substantial Development Permit and Shorelines Management regulations. The applicant's proposed development will be outside of the 200 foot threshold and staff determined that it is not subject to those regulations. A drainage ditch along the City right-of-way runs along the west side of the property. The ditch is a non-regulated stream with associated non-regulated wetlands. (Wetland and Stream study for the project).
12. The tree inventory showed 32 existing trees. The applicant proposes replacing those with 73 new trees and other landscaping (see below).
13. The applicant will be demolishing the existing warehouse structures that cover the 3.07 acres proposed for the hotel. The applicant will be retaining the other building on the remaining 4.73 acres. There will be no development or demolition within 200 feet of May Creek.
14. The applicant proposes developing a 5-story hotel on the north portion or 3.07 acres of the site. The 173 room hotel building will be 60 feet tall and contain 122,000 square feet of interior space. It will have a footprint of approximately 29,336 square feet. The complex will also contain retail space, fitness center, spa, conference space, banquet facilities and a restaurant. There will be underground parking.
15. The hotel's footprint will be L-shaped. The long leg of the "L", oriented north to south, will face Lake Washington Boulevard. The short leg will be oriented east to west along the north end of the parcel. A plaza with water feature will be located in the crook of the "L". Parking will generally be located east of the building.
16. The applicant will be using a variety of materials for the exterior of the building. It will contain stone veneer, hardie shingles, lap siding and metal roofs. There will be "northwest" style overhangs and trusses. The appearance is intended to complement the development of the Barbee Mill plat west of Lake Washington Boulevard. The COR Zone and the Urban Design District require both vertical and horizontal modulation a minimum of 2 feet at an interval of 40 feet to add interest and quality to the project. Additionally, there is to be a building setback of 10 feet for buildings over 50 feet in height. The plans show that the building does meet the horizontal and vertical modulations and that the top story observes an approximately 12-foot setback for most of that story and varies from zero feet to 39.5 feet. Staff has suggested that does meet the intent and with the variety of eaves, trusses, bump-outs, balconies and differentiated materials it more than meets the spirit of the "guidelines."
17. The entry from the east side or parking areas will be set off by the water feature that contains a Koi pond and pedestrian bridge. The Lake Washington entry will have a canopy.
18. Landscaping in the COR zone is developed as part of the Site Plan review process but is also governed by landscape requirements for surface parking lots. Along with the 73 new trees replacing the 32 that would be removed, the applicant proposes approximately 39,000 square feet of landscaping. New landscaping would be installed around the perimeter of the subject site, around the perimeter of the hotel building and in and around the parking lot. The landscaping will be confined to the 3.07 acres that the applicant proposes developing with the hotel. Street trees will be planted along Lake Washington

Boulevard and will be spaced 30 feet on center. A large variety of other landscape plants will be used throughout the site. The applicant did not submit the necessary irrigation plan. Parking lots with 100 or more stalls require 35 square feet of landscaping per stall, a minimum of 5 feet in width, 1 tree per 6 stalls, 5 shrubs per 100 square feet and landscaping within 50 feet of parking stalls. Staff calculated that the submitted plans meet the minimum requirements.

19. Staff has calculated the required parking based on use as a minimum of 223 and a maximum of 235 stalls and the applicant proposes 231 stalls, meeting code. There would be 107 stalls in the parking garage, and 124 surface stalls including 6 ADA stalls and stalls for five Neighborhood Electric Vehicles. Staff noted that for parking lots of this size 7 ADA stalls are required. Staff noted that both parking areas meet code for dimensions and compact stalls.
20. Lot coverage permitted in the COR zone for a building with surface parking is 65 percent. The proposed 29,336 square foot building covers approximately 22 percent of the 3.08 acres proposed for the hotel complex. The setback from the freeway is a required 10 feet whereas other setbacks are determined during site plan review. The applicant proposes a 20 foot setback from Lake Washington Boulevard, its apparent front yard, 60 feet from the north property line, 129 feet from its eastern, freeway property line and 418 feet from the south property line (including the acreage outside of the 3.07 acres). The zone permits buildings of 125 feet or 10 stories whereas 60 feet and five stories are proposed.
21. The applicant will provide access to the subject site via two locations. One driveway will be located along the north boundary of the subject site. The second, main driveway will be a more formal, two-lane gateway driveway at Lake Washington Boulevard located south of the hotel building.
22. Garbage and recycling areas are determined by use but hotels are not specifically identified. Staff evaluated the use as an office use that would require approximately 732 square feet of space and considered the fact that the applicant will be using a trash compactor in determining that the proposed 379.52 feet was adequate. The applicant has requested that this refuge complex not contain the roof required by the minimum standards since it requires dumpsters be moved out for collection since the dumpsters cannot be raised to truck level with a roof enclosure.
23. The development will increase traffic approximately 1,400 trips. There will be approximately 97 a.m. trips and 102 p.m. trips. The City's estimate of 1,413 trips matches the numbers predicted by the applicant.
24. As part of the development of the subject site the applicant proposes raising the grade of the site to match Lake Washington Boulevard. This will expose the hotel to the general public and allow the public to enter the site from surrounding sidewalks and trails.
25. Staff in its matrix chart has identified compliance, partial compliance or failure to meet the District C Design Guidelines minimum standards as well as suggested guidelines. That matrix is adopted by this office and incorporated into this report by reference. Particular reference is made to lighting for safety and not spilling off the site, facade treatment along the Lake Washington frontage lacking character elements to break up blank or rather unadorned lengths of facade, pedestrian paths in the parking areas and sufficient to provide both a trail link and pedestrian link around the site and connecting to the May Creek and King County paths and trails.
26. No Planned Action Ordinance was adopted for this site.

27. Stormwater will be collected and conveyed to what the applicant terms a rain garden for treatment and then conveyed to an offsite ditch that runs along the west side of the site. The ditch conveys water to May Creek and then Lake Washington. As discussed in the SEPA Appeal decision issued with this project, the proposal will not be using infiltration and the stormwater will not be exacerbating any issues with pollutants from the Quendall Terminals site discharging into Lake Washington. The applicant will be governed by City, State and Federal regulations regarding discharges from the subject site.
28. Sewer and water are provided to the subject site by the City.

CONCLUSIONS:

1. The project is subject to both Master Plan and Site Plan review as well as review under the District C Design Guidelines and the COR special considerations. The fact that only one building is involved in this proposal makes consideration of Master Planning for the subject site mirror the Site Plan review standards. While the building will contain a mix of uses including a restaurant as well as the much larger hotel, these various uses are included in the one facade scheme. It would make more sense to invoke the Master Plan review when the remainder of the 7.8 acre site is developed to make sure it is well coordinated with this current hotel complex.
2. The site plan ordinance provides a number of specific criteria for reviewing a site plan. Those criteria are generally represented in part by the following enumeration:
 - a. Conformance with the Comprehensive Plan;
 - b. Conformance with the Building and Zoning Codes;
 - c. Mitigation of impacts on surrounding properties and uses;
 - d. Mitigation of the impacts of the proposal on the subject site itself;
 - e. Conservation of property values;
 - f. Provision for safe and efficient vehicle and pedestrian circulation;
 - g. Provision of adequate light and air;
 - h. Adequacy of public services to accommodate the proposed use;The proposed use satisfies these and other particulars of the ordinance.
3. The Comprehensive Plan's designation for this area is for the development of larger scale commercial, office and residential uses befitting what are some of the larger parcels in the City. Many COR parcels were used for industrial production that dedicated larger swaths of lands for those purposes. As some of those industrial uses have moved away, the land is available for larger projects. The proposed hotel, especially in conjunction with the Seahawk's training complex is such a large scale project. The hotel is a kind of mixed use - temporary residences for patrons while a commercial operation. The hotel will also integrate a restaurant and retail uses into the mix. The proposal is compatible with the goal of transforming old industrial sites into high quality development.
4. The proposal in the main is compatible with the Zoning Code. It meets the height and setback

requirements of the code. It provides the complement of parking required. It meets the design details for modulation and articulation found in the Code and in the District C Design Guidelines. The top floor does not completely abide by the suggested setbacks from lower floors but on average exceeds those setbacks and greatly exceeds those setbacks on many of the top floor's facades. Staff found it was an appropriate design. Similarly, staff found that the proposal meets the code requirements for garbage and recycling and in comparison to the overall size and bulk of the facility and it appears staff is correct. This office does have some problems with the fact that the roof required appears to conflict with actual pickup services by garbage/recycle handlers. Staff and the City need to review these issues. Compliance with actual Building and Fire Code provisions will be verified when appropriate detailed permits are submitted.

5. The building will be taller than the former warehouse uses on the subject site but it certainly is more graciously designed. It will be taller than the residential uses west of Lake Washington Boulevard but shorter than the nearby training center. It will provide a buffer from I-405 and a transition from the freeway interchange to the residential uses located along Lake Washington Boulevard. The State has asked for mitigation and that is incorporated into the ERC's conditions. Turn lanes should mitigate impacts of traffic along Lake Washington Boulevard. The nature of the trips will also be different from the former industrial use of the site. An appeal was filed of the ERC's decision. That appeal was directed at minimizing the potential impacts of converting a large area of impermeable surface to a new hotel facility. There was a misunderstanding of how stormwater would be handled. The appeal was denied but issues raised in that appeal can be further clarified in the Site Plan review. The site will still be conveying its storm waters to May Creek and Lake Washington. Those waters should be handled with respect and appropriately treated by whatever water retention, detention or "rain garden" feature is used. The applicant should use best available science in treating stormwater before conveying it to the roadside ditch. There is no reason to jeopardize May Creek and/or Lake Washington with pollutants created or collected on this site's paved or treated landscaping areas.
6. The proposal will replace old warehouses with a modern hotel with substantial exterior appeal. The building will use a variety of materials to break up the apparent bulk of the building and will add appreciably to the landscaping on the site as well as along Lake Washington Boulevard. The longest facade treatment along Lake Washington Boulevard has a number of horizontal and vertical breaks providing an interesting appearance. Coupled with the variety of materials, wood, hardie board, veneer treatments as well as roof trusses all add to the visual variety the building presents to the public. Staff has noted that additional opening in what are considered blank walls will be needed along this facade to comply with code and provide the visual interest of the building. There will be perimeter landscaping added around the hotel and around the general site. The applicant will be providing street trees along Lake Washington Boulevard for the extent of the development proposal. The applicant should provide landscaping along the remainder of Lake Washington Boulevard and along the eastern and southern perimeter of the parking areas. The Master Plan process does include "master planning" for the entire subject site. While the applicant is trying to confine its footprint, the spare nature of the remaining site will detract from what appears to be a quality image. Therefore, the remaining acreage should be incorporated at least minimally. The Master Plan cannot escape that there is a much larger site that suffers from old, deteriorating buildings that will reflect on the current proposal. This office believes that the applicant and staff can work on a plan that accommodates additional landscaping, even temporary landscaping in planter boxes with some larger trees to screen or breakup the view of the background unsightly portions of the site east and west of the parking areas. Additionally, the applicant should plant additional street trees along the remaining Lake Washington Boulevard frontage at the same ratio and species as on the north frontage.

7. The redevelopment of this now underutilized site will help increase the tax base of the City and the removal of old warehouses should conserve if not increase property values. Obviously, there will be more general hubbub and traffic than a vacant warehousing site produces. These were anticipated when the Comprehensive Plan and zoning were enacted for this site and this area. Redevelopment of this site is a vital element of the City's objectives for this area.
8. The internal circulation and the pedestrian paths seem generally appropriate. Distinctive marking to provide visual separation of pedestrian routes from vehicular crossings may need better definition. As indicated by staff, this site connects trails in the vicinity and the applicant should make appropriate provisions for trail users as well as general pedestrian traffic. Staff's recommendations on path width are appropriate.
9. While the building and bulk are larger than what is on the site, clearly the proposed 60 foot height is substantially less than permitted in the zone. In addition, the generous setbacks provided as well as the width of I-405 and Lake Washington Boulevard will aid in letting air and light penetrate the subject site as well as surrounding properties.
10. As noted, there will be more comings and goings from this site than the community is used to but development has occurred to its west and that has already introduced more urban tumult. There will be the usual but temporary construction noise and I-405 already adds to the ambient noise levels in this area.
11. There are available urban services including sewer and water. The applicant will be paying a Fire Mitigation fee.
12. The redevelopment of the site will counter the neighborhood deterioration and blight that the current site represents. The project looks very well-designed and should be an asset to the community and City as a whole.
13. The project is also required to comply with the COR Zone special review criteria as well as the District C Design Guidelines. As discussed above, this office has adopted staff's analysis and recommendations regarding compliance with those numerous criteria. Some of the thematic requirements overlap the broad review of the Site Plan criteria. Specific requirements were covered by the Staff review and are incorporated into this report. They are attached to the end of this report.
14. The special criteria for the COR zone include:
 - a. The plan is consistent with a Planned Action Ordinance, if applicable.
 - b. The plan creates a compact, urban development that includes a compatible mix of uses that meets the Comprehensive Plan vision and policy statements for the Commercial-Office-Residential Comprehensive Plan designation.
 - c. The plan incorporates public and private open spaces to provide adequate areas for passive and active recreation by the occupants/users of the site, and/or to protect existing natural systems.
 - d. The plan provides view corridors to the shoreline area and Mt. Rainier where applicable.
 - e. Public access is provided to water and/or shoreline areas;

- f. The plan provides distinctive focal points such as public area plazas, prominent architectural features, or other items.
 - g. Public and/or private streets are arranged in a layout that provides reasonable access to property and supports the land use envisioned.
 - h. The plan accommodates and promotes transit, pedestrian, and other alternative modes of transportation.
15. No Planned action ordinance is involved in this review. The property does not lie along Lake Washington. The height of the building should provide views of the lake and view corridors might exist between the homes on the west side of the boulevard. The project will accommodate the trail as well as retail shops and a restaurant open to the public. The Koi pond, bridge and paths as well as the prominent entry and facade features provide a focal point. Transportation fees as well as accommodations to the State and turning lanes will provide reasonable access to the subject site. At the moment, public transit does not travel this route. The applicant has expressed a willingness to accommodate such access.
16. In conclusion, the proposed use complements activity that has been occurring in this area. It is hoped that the development of the north portion of this site will spur redevelopment of the southern portion.

DECISION:

The Site Plan is approved subject to the following conditions:

- 1. A detailed landscape plan and irrigation plan shall be prepared by a landscape architect registered in the State of Washington, a certified nurseryman, or other similarly qualified professional, and be submitted by the applicant and approved by the Current Planning Project Manager prior to issuance of the building permit.
- 2. The applicant shall provide a revised site plan that depicts 7 ADA parking spaces. The revised site plan shall be submitted by the applicant and approved by the Current Planning Project Manager prior to issuance of construction permit.
- 3. The applicant shall submit an access driveway grade cross section indicating compliance with RMC 4-4-080.I.6.b to be submitted by the applicant and approved by the Current Planning Project Manager prior to issuance of construction permit.
- 4. The street vacation, file # VAC-09-001, shall be completed prior to Certificate of Final Occupancy.
- 5. The applicant shall redesign the west elevation to feature a pedestrian-oriented façade. The new elevation drawings shall be submitted to the Department of Community and Economic Development project manager for review and approval prior to building permit approval.
- 6. The applicant shall submit a new site plan that indicates the entire pedestrian pathways through the parking lot as a different material or texture from the adjacent paving prior to building permit approval. This site plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Department of Community and Economic Development project manager.
- 7. The applicant shall provide an updated site plan to the City of Renton Current Planning Project Manager indicating 12-foot sidewalk widths and a 10-foot wide landscape strip along the frontage of the 3.07 acres of the development site, prior to construction permit approval.
- 8. The applicant shall be required to provide a lighting plan that adequately provides for public safety without casting excessive glare on adjacent properties to the Current Planning Project Manager for

review and approval at the time of building permit review.

9. The applicant shall use best available science in treating stormwater before conveying it to the roadside ditch. The stormwater shall be treated by whatever means including water retention, detention or "rain garden" feature in order to reduce pollution entering the ditch and then May Creek. The development shall not jeopardize May Creek and/or Lake Washington with pollutants created or collected on this site's paved or treated landscaping areas.
10. The applicant and staff shall work on a plan that accommodates additional landscaping, even temporary landscaping in planter boxes with some larger trees to screen or breakup the view of the background unsightly portions of the site east and west of the parking areas. Additionally, the applicant should plant additional street trees along the remaining Lake Washington Boulevard frontage at the same ratio and species as is planted along the north frontage.

ORDERED THIS 10th day of September 2009.

FRED J. KAUFMAN
HEARING EXAMINER

TRANSMITTED THIS 10th day of September 2009 to the following:

Mayor Denis Law	Dave Pargas, Fire
Jay Covington, Chief Administrative Officer	Larry Meckling, Building Official
Julia Medzegian, Council Liaison	Planning Commission
Marty Wine, Assistant CAO	Transpiration Division
Gregg Zimmerman, PBPW Administrator	Utilities Division
Alex Pietsch, Economic Development	Neil Watts, Development Services
Jennifer Henning, Development Services	Janet Conklin, Development Services
Stacy Tucker, Development Services	Renton Reporter

Pursuant to Title IV, Chapter 8, Section 100G of the City's Code, **request for reconsideration must be filed in writing on or before 5:00 p.m., September 24, 2009.** Any aggrieved person feeling that the decision of the Examiner is ambiguous or based on erroneous procedure, errors of law or fact, error in judgment, or the discovery of new evidence which could not be reasonably available at the prior hearing may make a written request for a review by the Examiner within fourteen (14) days from the date of the Examiner's decision. This request shall set forth the specific ambiguities or errors discovered by such appellant, and the Examiner may, after review of the record, take further action as he deems proper.

An appeal to the City Council is governed by Title IV, Chapter 8, Section 110, which requires that such appeal be filed with the City Clerk, accompanying a filing fee of \$75.00 and meeting other specified requirements. Copies of this ordinance are available for inspection or purchase in the Finance Department, first floor of City Hall. **An appeal must be filed in writing on or before 5:00 p.m., September 24, 2009.**

If the Examiner's Recommendation or Decision contains the requirement for Restrictive Covenants, the executed Covenants will be required prior to approval by City Council or final processing of the file. You may contact this office for information on formatting covenants.

The Appearance of Fairness Doctrine provides that no ex parte (private one-on-one) communications may occur concerning pending land use decisions. This means that parties to a land use decision may not communicate in private with any decision-maker concerning the proposal. Decision-makers in the land use process include both the Hearing Examiner and members of the City Council.

All communications concerning the proposal must be made in public. This public communication permits all interested parties to know the contents of the communication and would allow them to openly rebut the evidence. Any violation of this doctrine would result in the invalidation of the request by the Court.

The Doctrine applies not only to the initial public hearing but to all Requests for Reconsideration as well as Appeals to the City Council.

a. Review of Compliance to District C Design Guidelines;

The subject property is located within Design District 'C'. The proposed project must meet the intent of the Design Regulations where the regulations are applicable. As demonstrated in the table below the proposal meets the intent of the Design Regulations on the basis of individual merit if all conditions of approval are met.

Two categories have been established: (a) "minimum standards" that must be met, and (b) "guidelines" that, while not mandatory, are considered in determining if the proposed action meets the intent of the design guidelines. The following are the categories for compliance:

M= Met	NM= Not Met	PM= Partially Met	NA= Not Applicable
---------------	--------------------	--------------------------	---------------------------

	M	N	P	N
A. SITE DESIGN AND BUILDING LOCATION:	M	M	M	A
Intent: To ensure that buildings are located in relation to streets and other buildings so that the Vision of the City of Renton can be realized for a high-density urban environment; so that businesses enjoy visibility from public rights-of-way; and to encourage pedestrian activity throughout the district.				
1. Site Design and Street Pattern:				
Intent: To ensure that the City of Renton Vision can be realized within the Urban Center Districts; plan districts that are organized for efficiency while maintaining flexibility for future development at high urban densities and intensities of use; create and maintain a safe, convenient network of streets of varying dimensions for vehicle circulation; and provide service to businesses.				

Minimum Standard: Provide a network of public and/or private local streets in addition to public arterials.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: Maintain a hierarchy of streets to provide organized circulation that promotes use by multiple transportation modes and to avoid overburdening the roadway system. The hierarchy shall consist of (from greatest in size to smallest): (a) High Visibility Street. A highly visible arterial street that warrants special design treatment to improve its appearance and maintain its transportation function. (b) Arterial Street. A street classified as a principal arterial on the City's Arterial Street Plan. (c) Pedestrian-Oriented Streets. Streets that are intended to feature a concentration of pedestrian activity. Such streets feature slow moving traffic, narrow travel lanes, on-street parking, and wide sidewalks. (d) Internal or local roads (public or private).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Building Location and Orientation: Intent: To ensure visibility of businesses; establish active, lively uses along sidewalks and pedestrian pathways; organize buildings in such a way that pedestrian use of the district is facilitated; encourage siting of structures so that natural light and solar access are available to other structures and open space; enhance the visual character and definition of streets within the district; provide an appropriate transition between buildings, parking areas, and other land uses and the street; and increase privacy for residential uses located near the street.				
Minimum Standard: Buildings on designated pedestrian-oriented streets shall feature "pedestrian-oriented facades" and clear connections to the sidewalk (see illustration, RMC 4-3-100E7a). Such buildings shall be located adjacent to the sidewalk, except where pedestrian-oriented space is located between the building and the sidewalk. Parking between the building and pedestrian-oriented streets is prohibited	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: Buildings fronting on pedestrian-oriented streets shall contain pedestrian-oriented uses.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: Nonresidential buildings may be located directly adjacent to any street as long as they feature a pedestrian-oriented façade <u>Staff Comment:</u> <i>The majority of the façade facing Lake Washington Boulevard would be in compliance with this minimum standard with the exception of south half of this façade on the ground floor. Approximately 62 feet of the southern side of the façade is not designed to meet this standard. This 62 feet is designed with stone veneer and vertical siding. As such, staff recommends a condition of approval that the applicant redesign the west elevation to feature a pedestrian-oriented façade. The new elevation drawings shall be submitted to the Department of Community and Economic Development for review and approval by the project manager prior to building permit approval.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Minimum Standard: Buildings containing street-level residential uses and single-purpose residential buildings shall be set back from the sidewalk a minimum of 10 feet and feature substantial landscaping between the sidewalk and the building (see illustration, RMC 4-3-100E7b)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: If buildings do not feature pedestrian-oriented facades they shall have substantial landscaping between the sidewalk and building. Such landscaping shall be at least 10 feet in width as measured from the sidewalk (see illustration, RMC 4-3-100E7c).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Guideline: Siting of a structure should take into consideration the continued availability of natural light (both direct and reflected) and direct sun exposure to nearby buildings and open space (except parking areas).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Guideline: Ground floor residential uses located near the street should be raised above street level for residents' privacy.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Building Entries:				
Intent: To make building entrances convenient to locate and easy to access, and ensure that building entries further the pedestrian nature of the fronting sidewalk and the urban character of the district.				
Minimum Standard: Multiple buildings on the same site should provide a continuous network of pedestrian paths and open spaces that incorporate landscaping to provide a directed view to building entries.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: Ground floor units should be directly accessible from the street or an open space such as a courtyard or garden that is accessible from the street.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: Secondary access (not fronting on a street) should have weather protection at least 4-1/2 feet wide over the entrance or other similar indicator of access.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: Pedestrian access should be provided to the building from property edges, adjacent lots, abutting street intersections, crosswalks, and transit stops.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: Features such as entries, lobbies, and display windows should be oriented to a street or pedestrian-oriented space; otherwise, screening or decorative features such as trellises, artwork, murals, landscaping, or combinations thereof should be incorporated into the street-oriented facade.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Guideline: For projects that include residential uses, entries should provide transition space between the public street and the private residence such as a porch, landscaped area, terrace, common area, lobby, or similar feature.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Transition to Surrounding Development:				
Intent: To shape redevelopment projects so that the character and value of Renton's long-established, existing neighborhoods are preserved.				
5. Service Element Location and Design:				
Intent: To reduce the potential negative impacts of service elements (i.e., waste				

receptacles, loading docks) by locating service and loading areas away from high-volume pedestrian areas, and screening them from view in high visibility areas.

Minimum Standard: Service elements shall be located and designed to minimize the impacts on the pedestrian environment and adjacent uses. Service elements shall be concentrated and located where they are accessible to service vehicles and convenient for tenant use (see illustration, RMC 4-3-100E7e).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: Garbage, recycling collection, and utility areas shall be enclosed, consistent with RMC 4-4-090 , Refuse and Recyclables Standards, and RMC 4-4-095 , Screening and Storage Height/Location Limitations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: In addition to standard enclosure requirements, garbage, recycling collection, and utility areas shall be enclosed on all sides, including the roof and screened around their perimeter by a wall or fence and have self-closing doors (see illustration, RMC 4-3-100E7f). <i>Staff Comment:</i> The proposed enclosure for the garbage and recycling collection area includes screening on all sides with the exception of a roof. The applicant has indicated that if a roof was provided then the dumpsters would have to be pushed or maneuvered out of the enclosure for collection because the collection trucks need to lift the dumpster to empty it into the truck. In order for the dumpsters to be directly lifted from the enclosure the exemption of the roof would be required. As such, staff recommends approval of this modification.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: The use of chain link, plastic, or wire fencing is prohibited.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: If the service area is adjacent to a street, pathway, or pedestrian-oriented space, a landscaped planting strip, minimum 3 feet wide, shall be located on 3 sides of such facility.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Guideline: Service enclosure fences should be made of masonry, ornamental metal or wood, or some combination of the three.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. Gateways:

Intent: To distinguish gateways as primary entrances to districts or to the City; provide special design features and architectural elements at gateways; and ensure that gateways, while they are distinctive within the context of the district, are compatible with the district in form and scale.

Minimum Standard: Developments located at district gateways shall be marked with visually prominent features (see illustration, subsection RMC 4-3-100.E7g).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: Gateway elements shall be oriented toward and scaled for both pedestrians and vehicles (see illustration, subsection RMC 4-3-100.E7h).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: Visual prominence shall be distinguished by two or more of the following: a. Public art; b. Monuments; c. Special landscape treatment; d. Open space/plaza; e. Identifying building form;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

f. Special paving, unique pedestrian scale lighting, or bollards; g. Prominent architectural features (trellis, arbor, pergola, or gazebo); h. Signage, displaying neighborhood or district entry identification (commercial signs are not allowed).				
B. PARKING AND VEHICULAR ACCESS:	M	N	P	N
Intent: To provide safe, convenient access to the Urban Center and the Center Village; incorporate various modes of transportation, including public mass transit, in order to reduce traffic volumes and other impacts from vehicles; ensure sufficient parking is provided, while encouraging creativity in reducing the impacts of parking areas; allow an active pedestrian environment by maintaining contiguous street frontages, without parking lot siting along sidewalks and building facades; minimize the visual impact of parking lots; and use access streets and parking to maintain an urban edge to the district.				
1. Location of Parking: Intent: To maintain active pedestrian environments along streets by placing parking lots primarily in back of buildings.				
Minimum Standard: On Designated Pedestrian-Oriented Streets: (a) Parking shall be at the side and/or rear of a building, with the exception of on-street parallel parking. No more than 60 feet of the street frontage measured parallel to the curb shall be occupied by off-street parking and vehicular access. (b) On-street parallel parking spaces located adjacent to the site can be included in calculation of required parking. For parking ratios based on use and zone, see RMC 4-4-080 , Parking, Loading and Driveway Regulations. (c) On-street parallel parking shall be required on both sides of the street.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: All parking lots located between a building and street or visible from a street shall feature landscaping between the sidewalk and building; see RMC 4-4-080F , Parking Lot Design Standards.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: The applicant must successfully demonstrate that the surface parking lot is designed to facilitate future structured parking and/or other infill development. For example, an appropriate surface parking area would feature a one thousand five hundred foot (1,500') maximum perimeter area and a minimum dimension on one side of two hundred feet (200'), unless project proponent can demonstrate future alternative use of the area would be physically possible. Exception: If there are size constraints inherent in the original parcel (see illustration, subsection F5a of this Section). Staff Comment: The proposed surface parking lot does not meet the minimum requirement of 1,500 feet of perimeter area. In addition, preliminary design and discussion with the applicant indicated that this proposed surface parking lot would remain with full build out of the subject site. Lake Washington	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<i>Boulevard is the only access to the subject site, which results in the requirement to provide internal vehicular circulation for the subject parcel. In order for there to be sufficient internal circulation at a future date, this surface parking lot would be required. As such, staff recommends approval of the surface parking lot as proposed.</i>				
Guideline: In areas of mixed use development, shared parking is recommended.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Guideline: If a limited number of parking spaces are made available in front of a building for passenger drop-off and pick-up, they shall be parallel to the building façade.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Guideline: When fronting on streets not designated as pedestrian-oriented, parking lots should be located on the interior portions of blocks and screened from the surrounding roadways by buildings, landscaping and/or gateway features as dictated by location.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Design of Surface Parking:				
Intent: To ensure safety of users of parking areas, convenience to businesses, and reduce the impact of parking lots wherever possible.				
Minimum Standard: Parking lot lighting shall not spill onto adjacent or abutting properties (see illustration, subsection RMC 4-3-100.F5b). <i>Staff Comment:</i> See section G. "Lighting" below.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: All surface parking lots shall be landscaped to reduce their visual impact (see RMC 4-4-080F7 , Landscape Requirements).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Guideline: Wherever possible, parking should be configured into small units, connected by landscaped areas to provide on-site buffering from visual impacts.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Guideline: Access to parking modules should be provided by public or private local streets with sidewalks on both sides where possible, rather than internal drive aisles.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Guideline: Where multiple driveways cannot be avoided, provide landscaping to separate and minimize their impact on the streetscape.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Structured Parking Garages:				
Intent: To more efficiently use land needed for vehicle parking; encourage the use of structured parking throughout the Urban Center and the Center Village; physically and visually integrate parking garages with other uses; and reduce the overall impact of parking garages when they are located in proximity to the designated pedestrian environment.				
Minimum Standard: Parking Structures Fronting Designated Pedestrian-Oriented Streets:				
(a) Parking structures shall provide space for ground floor commercial uses along street frontages at a minimum of 75% of the frontage width (see illustration, subsection RMC 4-3-100.F5c).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b) The entire facade must feature a pedestrian-oriented facade.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: Parking Structures Fronting Non-Pedestrian-Oriented Streets:				

(a) Parking structures fronting non-pedestrian-oriented streets and not featuring a pedestrian-oriented facade shall be set back at least 6 feet from the sidewalk and feature substantial landscaping. This includes a combination of evergreen and deciduous trees, shrubs, and ground cover. This setback shall be increased to 10 feet adjacent to high visibility streets.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b) The Director may allow a reduced setback where the applicant can successfully demonstrate that the landscaped area and/or other design treatment meets the intent of these standards and guidelines. Possible treatments to reduce the setback include landscaping components plus one or more of the following integrated with the architectural design of the building: (1) Ornamental grillwork (other than vertical bars); (2) Decorative artwork; (3) Display windows; (4) Brick, tile, or stone; (5) Pre-cast decorative panels; (6) Vine-covered trellis; (7) Raised landscaping beds with decorative materials; or (8) Other treatments that meet the intent of this standard.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(c) Facades shall be articulated architecturally, so as to maintain a human scale and to avoid a solid wall. Vehicular entrances to nonresidential or mixed use parking structures shall be articulated by arches, lintels, masonry trim, or other architectural elements and/or materials (see illustration, subsection RMC 4-3-100.F5d).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Guideline: Parking garage entries should be designed and sited to complement, not subordinate, the pedestrian entry. If possible, locate the parking entry away from the primary street, to either the side or rear of the building.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Guideline: Parking garage entries should not dominate the streetscape.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Guideline: The design of structured parking at finished grade under a building should minimize the apparent width of garage entries.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Guideline: Parking within the building should be enclosed or screened through any combination of walls, decorative grilles, or trellis work with landscaping.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Guideline: Parking garages should be designed to be complementary with adjacent buildings. Use similar forms, materials, and/or details to enhance garages.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Guideline: Parking service and storage functions should be located away from the street edge and generally not be visible from the street or sidewalks.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Vehicular Access:				
Intent: To maintain a contiguous, uninterrupted sidewalk by minimizing, consolidating and/or eliminating vehicular access off streets within pedestrian environments and/or designated pedestrian-oriented streets.				
Minimum Standard: Parking garages shall be accessed at the rear of buildings	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

or from non-pedestrian-oriented streets when available.				
Minimum Standard: Surface parking driveways are prohibited on pedestrian-oriented streets.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: Parking lot entrances, driveways, and other vehicular access points on high visibility streets shall be restricted to one entrance and exit lane per 500 linear feet as measured horizontally along the street.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
C. PEDESTRIAN ENVIRONMENT:	M	N	P	N
Intent: To enhance the urban character of development in the Urban Center and the Center Village by creating pedestrian networks and by providing strong links from streets and drives to building entrances; make the pedestrian environment safer and more convenient, comfortable, and pleasant to walk between businesses, on sidewalks, to and from access points, and through parking lots; and promote the use of multi-modal and public transportation systems in order to reduce other vehicular traffic.	M	M	M	A
1. Pathways through Parking Lots:				
Intent: To provide safe and attractive pedestrian connections to buildings, parking garages, and parking lots.				
Minimum Standard: Clearly delineated pedestrian pathways and/or private streets shall be provided throughout parking areas.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: Within parking areas, pedestrian pathways shall be provided perpendicular to the applicable building facade, at a maximum distance of 150 feet apart (see illustration, subsection RMC 4-3-100.G4a).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Pedestrian Circulation:				
Intent: To create a network of linkages for pedestrians to improve safety and convenience and enhance the pedestrian environment.				
Minimum Standard: Developments shall include an integrated pedestrian circulation system that connects buildings, open space, and parking areas with the adjacent street sidewalk system and adjacent properties (see illustration, subsection RMC 4-3-100.G4b).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: Sidewalks located between buildings and streets shall be raised above the level of vehicular travel.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: Pedestrian pathways within parking lots or parking modules shall be differentiated by material or texture from adjacent paving materials (see illustration, subsection RMC 4-3-100.G4c). <i>Staff Comment: The provided plan sets indicate that portions of the pedestrian pathways within the parking lots would be different material or texture from the adjacent paving materials, although there are some portions that appear to be asphalt with striping. As such, staff recommends as a condition of approval that the applicant submit a new site plant that indicates the entire pedestrian pathways through the parking lot as a different material or texture from the adjacent paving prior to building permit approval. This site plan shall be</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<i>reviewed and approved by the Department of Community and Economic Development project manager.</i>				
Minimum Standard: Sidewalks and pathways along the facades of buildings shall be of sufficient width to accommodate anticipated numbers of users. Specifically:				
(a) Sidewalks and pathways along the facades of mixed use and retail buildings 100 or more feet in width (measured along the facade) shall provide sidewalks at least 12 feet in width. The walkway shall include an 8 foot minimum unobstructed walking surface and street trees (see illustration, subsection RMC-4-3-100.G4d). <i>Staff Comment:</i> The proposed sidewalk width is 10-feet and the proposed landscape strip is 9-feet in width. As mentioned above in the project narrative, the City has received Capital Improvement Funds, which potentially would fund the extension of the May Creek Trail, which would end at the south end of the subject parcel. In order for this trial to continue to the existing King County Trial system located north of the subject site, near VMAC, the City's Parks Department requested that the sidewalk in this area have enough width to accommodate a multi-use trail in addition to a traditional sidewalk. Hotel patrons and members of the public would be using this sidewalk; in addition, trail users would be utilizing this sidewalk to connect to the grater King County trial system. Based on the anticipated number of users in this location, 10-feet would not be appropriate sidewalk width to accommodate anticipated pedestrian traffic. As such, staff recommends a condition of approval that the applicant provide an updated site plan to the City of Renton Project Manager indicating a 12-foot sidewalk width and a 10-foot wide landscape strip along the frontage of the 3.07 acres of the development site, Prior to construction permit approval.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) To increase business visibility and accessibility, breaks in the tree coverage adjacent to major building entries shall be allowed.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(c) For all other interior pathways, the proposed walkway shall be of sufficient width to accommodate the anticipated number of users. A 10 - 12 foot pathway, for example, can accommodate groups of persons walking four abreast, or two couples passing one another. An 8 foot pathway will accommodate three individuals walking abreast, whereas a smaller 5 – 6 foot pathway will accommodate two individuals.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: Locate pathways with clear sight lines to increase safety. Landscaping shall not obstruct visibility of walkway or sight lines to building entries.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: All pedestrian walkways shall provide an all-weather walking surface unless the applicant can demonstrate that the proposed surface is appropriate for the anticipated number of users and complementary to the design of the development.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Guideline: Through-block connections should be made between buildings, between streets, and to connect sidewalks with public spaces. Preferred location for through-block connections is mid-block (see illustration, subsection RMC 4-3-100.G4e)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Guideline: Between buildings of up to and including two stories in height, through-block connections should be at least 6 feet in width	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Guideline: Between buildings three stories in height or greater, through-block connections should be at least 12 feet in width	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Guideline: Transit stops should be located along designated transit routes a maximum 0.25 mile apart	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Guideline: As an alternative to some of the required street trees, developments may provide pedestrian-scaled light fixtures at appropriate spacing and no taller than 14 feet in height. No less than one tree or light fixture per 30 lineal feet of the required walkway should be provided	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Guideline: Delineation of pathways may be through the use of architectural features, such as trellises, railings, low seat walls, or similar treatment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Guideline: Mid-block connections are desirable where a strong linkage between uses can be established.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Guideline: Decorative fences, with the exception of chain link fences, may be allowed when appropriate to the situation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Pedestrian Amenities:				
Intent: To create attractive spaces that unify the building and street environments and are inviting and comfortable for pedestrians; and provide publicly accessible areas that function for a variety of activities, at all times of the year, and under typical seasonal weather conditions.				
Minimum Standard: Provide pedestrian overhead weather protection in the form of awnings, marquees, canopies, or building overhangs. These elements shall be a minimum of 4-1/2 feet wide along at least 75 percent of the length of the building facade, a maximum height of 15 feet above the ground elevation, and no lower than 8 feet above ground level. Staff Comment: As proposed, canopies along the façade fronting Lake Washington Boulevard exceed the minimum width standards although do not meet the minimum length standards. Canopies have been proposed to be provided for approximately 38.5 percent of the façade or approximately 60 liner feet. The 60 feet of the façade where canopies are proposed is along the portion of the building that would be the least distance (smallest setback) from Lake Washington Boulevard. Although, the proposed hotel design provides modulation along this façade that brings many portions of the structure back from Lake Washington Boulevard where canopies would not be achieving the desired intend of overhead weather protection. As such, staff recommends approval of the proposed 60 liner feet of canopy coverage.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: Site furniture provided in public spaces shall be made of	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<p> durable, vandal- and weather-resistant materials that do not retain rainwater and can be reasonably maintained over an extended period of time. </p>				
<p> Minimum Standard: Site furniture and amenities shall not impede or block pedestrian access to public spaces or building entrances. </p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p> Guideline: Transit shelters, bicycle racks, benches, trash receptacles, and other street furniture should be provided. </p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p> Guideline: Street amenities such as outdoor group seating, kiosks, fountains, and public art should be provided. </p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p> Guideline: Architectural elements that incorporate plants, such as facade-mounted planting boxes or trellises or ground-related or hanging containers are encouraged, particularly at building entrances, in publicly accessible spaces, and at facades along pedestrian-oriented streets (see illustration, subsection RMC 4-3-100.G4f). </p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p> D. LANDSCAPING/RECREATION AREAS/COMMON OPEN SPACE: </p>	M	N	P	N
<p> Intent: To provide visual relief in areas of expansive paving or structures; define logical areas of pedestrian and vehicular circulation; and add to the aesthetic enjoyment of the area by the community. To have areas suitable for both passive and active recreation by residents, workers, and visitors; provide these areas in sufficient amounts and in safe and convenient locations; and provide the opportunity for community gathering in places centrally located and designed to encourage such activity. </p>				
<p> 1. Landscaping: </p>				
<p> Intent: Landscaping is intended to reinforce the architecture or concept of the area; provide visual and climatic relief in areas of expansive paving or structures; channelize and define logical areas of pedestrian and vehicular circulation; and add to the aesthetic enjoyment of the area by the community. </p>				
<p> Minimum Standard: All pervious areas shall be landscaped (see RMC 4-4-070, Landscaping). </p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p> Minimum Standard: Street trees are required and shall be located between the curb edge and building, as determined by the City of Renton. </p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p> Minimum Standard: On designated pedestrian-oriented streets, street trees shall be installed with tree grates. For all other streets, street tree treatment shall be as determined by the City of Renton (see illustration, subsection RMC 4-3-100.H3a). </p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p> Minimum Standard: The proposed landscaping shall be consistent with the design intent and program of the building, the site, and use. </p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p> Minimum Standard: The landscape plan shall demonstrate how the proposed landscaping, through the use of plant material and nonvegetative elements, reinforces the architecture or concept of the development. </p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p> Minimum Standard: Surface parking areas shall be screened by landscaping in order to reduce views of parked cars from streets (see RMC 4-4-080F7, </p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Landscape Requirements). Such landscaping shall be at least 10 feet in width as measured from the sidewalk (see illustration, subsection RMC 4-3-100.H3b.															
Minimum Standard: Trees at an average minimum rate of one tree per 30 lineal feet of street frontage. Permitted tree species are those that reach a mature height of at least 35 feet. Minimum height or caliper at planting shall be eight feet or two inch caliper (as measured four feet from the top of the root ball) respectively.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>										
Minimum Standard: Shrubs at the minimum rate of one per 20 square feet of landscaped area. Shrubs shall be at least 12 inches tall at planting and have a mature height between three and four feet. <i>Staff Comment: As proposed the shrubs meet the minimum height but the proposed rate of planning is less then one per 20 square feet of landscaped area. The applicant has proposed to use raingardens, within these areas ornamental shrubs are not proposed to be planted. The proposed raingardens reflect the applicant's desire to provide a development that minimizes its effects on the environment and/or is "green". The raingardens are calculated into the landscaped area and therefore reduce the ratio of shrubs to landscaped area; as such, staff recommends approval of this modification.</i>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>										
Minimum Standard: Ground cover shall be planted in sufficient quantities to provide at least 90 percent coverage of the landscaped area within three years of installation.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>										
Minimum Standard: The applicant shall provide a maintenance assurance device, prior to occupancy, for a period of not less than three years and in sufficient amount to ensure required landscape standards have been met by the third year following installation.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>										
Minimum Standard: Surface parking with more than 14 stalls shall be landscaped as follows: (1) Required Amount:		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>										
<table><tr><td>Total Number of Spaces</td><td>Minimum Required Landscape Area*</td></tr><tr><td>15 to 50</td><td>15 square feet/parking space</td></tr><tr><td>51 to 99</td><td>25 square feet/parking space</td></tr><tr><td>100 or more</td><td>35 square feet/parking space</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">* Landscape area calculations above and planting requirements below exclude perimeter parking lot landscaping areas.</td></tr></table>		Total Number of Spaces	Minimum Required Landscape Area*	15 to 50	15 square feet/parking space	51 to 99	25 square feet/parking space	100 or more	35 square feet/parking space	* Landscape area calculations above and planting requirements below exclude perimeter parking lot landscaping areas.					
Total Number of Spaces	Minimum Required Landscape Area*														
15 to 50	15 square feet/parking space														
51 to 99	25 square feet/parking space														
100 or more	35 square feet/parking space														
* Landscape area calculations above and planting requirements below exclude perimeter parking lot landscaping areas.															
(2) Provide trees, shrubs, and ground cover in the required interior parking lot landscape areas.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>										
(3) Plant at least one tree for every six parking spaces. Permitted tree species are those that reach a mature height of at least 35 feet. Minimum		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>										

height or caliper at planting shall be eight feet or two inch caliper (as measured four feet from the top of the root ball) respectively.				
(4) Plant shrubs at a rate of five per 100 square feet of landscape area. Shrubs shall be at least 16 inches tall at planting and have a mature height between three and four feet.	☒	☐	☐	☐
(5) Up to 50 percent of shrubs may be deciduous.	☒	☐	☐	☐
(6) Select and plant ground cover so as to provide 90 percent coverage within three years of planting; provided, that mulch is applied until plant coverage is complete.	☒	☐	☐	☐
(7) Do not locate a parking stall more than 50 feet from a landscape area.	☒	☐	☐	☐
Minimum Standard: Regular maintenance shall be provided to ensure that plant materials are kept healthy and that dead or dying plant materials are replaced.	☒	☐	☐	☐
Minimum Standard: Underground, automatic irrigation systems are required in all landscape areas. <i>Staff Comment: An irrigation plan was not submitted as part of the application. Therefore staff recommends, as a condition of approval, the applicant submit an irrigation plan to and be approved by the Current Planning Project Manager prior to construction or building permit approval.</i>	☐	☒	☐	☐
Guideline: Landscaping should be used to soften and integrate the bulk of buildings.	☒	☐	☐	☐
Guideline: Landscaping should be provided that appropriately provides either screening of unwanted views or focuses attention to preferred views.	☒	☐	☐	☐
Guideline: Use of low maintenance, drought-resistant landscape material is encouraged.	☒	☐	☐	☐
Guideline: Choice of materials should reflect the level of maintenance that will be available.	☒	☐	☐	☐
Guideline: Seasonal landscaping and container plantings are encouraged, particularly at building entries and in publicly accessible spaces.	☐	☐	☒	☐
Guideline: Window boxes, containers for plantings, hanging baskets, or other planting feature elements should be made of weather-resistant materials that can be reasonably maintained.	☒	☐	☐	☐
Guideline: Landscaping should be used to screen parking lots from adjacent or neighboring properties.	☒	☐	☐	☐
2. Recreation Areas and Common Open Space:				
Intent: To ensure that districts have areas suitable for both passive and active recreation by residents, workers, and visitors and that these areas are of sufficient size for the intended activity and in convenient locations; create usable, accessible, and inviting open space that is accessible to the public; and promote pedestrian activity on pedestrian-oriented streets particularly at street corners.				
Minimum Standard: Mixed use residential and attached housing developments of ten or more dwelling units shall provide a minimum area of common space or recreation area equal to 50 square feet per unit. The common space area shall	☐	☐	☐	☒

be aggregated to provide usable area(s) for residents. The location, layout, and proposed type of common space or recreation area shall be subject to approval by the Director. The required common open space shall be satisfied with one or more of the elements listed below. The Director may require more than one of the following elements for developments having more than 100 units. (a) Courtyards, plazas, or multi-purpose open spaces; (b) Upper level common decks, patios, terraces, or roof gardens. Such spaces above the street level must feature views or amenities that are unique to the site and are provided as an asset to the development; (c) Pedestrian corridors dedicated to passive recreation and separate from the public street system; (d) Recreation facilities including, but not limited to, tennis/sports courts, swimming pools, exercise areas, game rooms, or other similar facilities; or (e) Children's play spaces.				
Minimum Standard: In mixed use residential and attached residential projects, required landscaping, driveways, parking, or other vehicular use areas shall not be counted toward the common space requirement or be located in dedicated outdoor recreation or common use areas.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: In mixed use residential and attached residential projects required yard setback areas shall not count toward outdoor recreation and common space unless such areas are developed as private or semi-private (from abutting or adjacent properties) courtyards, plazas or passive use areas containing landscaping and fencing sufficient to create a fully usable area accessible to all residents of the development (see illustration, subsection RMC 4-3-100.H3c).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: Private decks, balconies, and private ground floor open space shall not count toward the common space/recreation area requirement.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: In mixed use residential and attached residential projects, other required landscaping and sensitive area buffers without common access links, such as pedestrian trails, shall not be included toward the required recreation and common space requirement.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: All buildings and developments with over 30,000 square feet of nonresidential uses (excludes parking garage floorplate areas) shall provide pedestrian-oriented space (see illustration, subsection RMC 4-3-100.H3d) according to the following formula:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1% of the lot area + 1% of the building area = Minimum amount of pedestrian-oriented space				
Minimum Standard: To qualify as pedestrian-oriented space, the following must be included: (a) Visual and pedestrian access (including barrier-free access) to the abutting structures from the public right-of-way or a nonvehicular courtyard;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<p>(b) Paved walking surfaces of either concrete or approved unit paving; (c) On-site or building-mounted lighting providing at least four foot-candles (average) on the ground; and <i>Staff Comment: See comment under G "Lighting" Below. Staff was unable to determine if the applicant complies with the minimum standards at this time.</i> (d) At least three feet of seating area (bench, ledge, etc.) or one individual seat per 60 square feet of plaza area or open space.</p>				
<p>Minimum Standard: The following features are encouraged in pedestrian-oriented space (see illustration, subsection RMC 4-3-100.H3e) and may be required by the Director: (a) Provide pedestrian-oriented uses on the building facade facing the pedestrian-oriented space. (b) Spaces should be positioned in areas with significant pedestrian traffic to provide interest and security – such as adjacent to a building entry. (c) Provide pedestrian-oriented facades on some or all buildings facing the space. (d) Provide movable public seating.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Minimum Standard: The following are prohibited within pedestrian-oriented space: (a) Adjacent unscreened parking lots; (b) Adjacent chain link fences; (c) Adjacent blank walls; (d) Adjacent dumpsters or service areas; and (e) Outdoor storage (shopping carts, potting soil bags, firewood, etc.) that do not contribute to the pedestrian environment.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Minimum Standard: The minimum required walkway areas shall not count as pedestrian-oriented space. However, where walkways are widened or enhanced beyond minimum requirements, the area may count as pedestrian-oriented space if the Director determines such space meets the definition of pedestrian-oriented space.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Minimum Standard: The location of public open space shall be considered in relation to building orientation, sun and light exposure, and local micro-climatic conditions.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Guideline: Common space areas in mixed use residential and attached residential projects should be centrally located so they are near a majority of dwelling units, accessible and usable to residents, and visible from surrounding units.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Guideline: Developments located at street intersections corners on designated pedestrian-oriented streets are encouraged to provide pedestrian-oriented space adjacent to the street corner to emphasize pedestrian activity (see illustration, subsection RMC 4-3-100.H3f).</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Guideline: Common space areas should be located to take advantage of surrounding features such as building entrances, significant landscaping, unique topography or architecture, and solar exposure.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Guideline: In mixed use residential and attached residential projects children's play space should be centrally located, visible from the dwellings, and away from hazardous areas like garbage dumpsters, drainage facilities, streets, and parking areas.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E. BUILDING ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN:	M	N	P	N
Intent: To encourage building design that is unique and urban in character, comfortable on a human scale, and uses appropriate building materials that are suitable for the Pacific Northwest climate. To discourage franchise retail architecture.	M	M	M	A
1. Building Character and Massing: Intent: To ensure that buildings are not bland and visually appear to be at a human scale; and ensure that all sides of a building, that can be seen by the public, are visually interesting.				
Minimum Standard: All building facades shall include measures to reduce the apparent scale of the building and add visual interest. Examples include modulation, articulation, defined entrances, and display windows (see illustration, subsection RMC 4-3-100.15a).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: All buildings shall be articulated with one or more of the following: (a) Defined entry features; (b) Window treatment; (c) Bay windows and/or balconies; (d) Roof line features; or (e) Other features as approved by the Director	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: Single purpose residential buildings shall feature building modulation as follows (see illustration, subsection RMC 4-3-100.15b): (a) The maximum width (as measured horizontally along the building's exterior) without building modulation shall be 40 feet. (b) The minimum width of modulation shall be 15 feet. (c) The minimum depth of modulation shall be the greater of six feet or not less than two-tenths multiplied by the height of the structure (finished grade to the top of the wall).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Guideline: Although streetfront buildings along designated pedestrian streets should strive to create a uniform street edge, building facades should generally be modulated and/or articulated with architectural elements to reduce the apparent size of new buildings, break up long blank walls, add visual interest, and enhance the character of the neighborhood.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Guideline: Buildings should be urban in character.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<p>Guideline: Buildings greater than 160 feet in length should provide a variety of techniques to reduce the apparent bulk and scale of the facade or provide an additional special design feature such as a clock tower, courtyard, fountain, or public gathering place to add visual interest (see illustration, subsection RMC 4-3-100.15c).</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>2. Ground-Level Details: Intent: To ensure that buildings are visually interesting and reinforce the intended human-scale character of the pedestrian environment; and ensure that all sides of a building within near or distant public view have visual interest.</p>				
<p>Minimum Standard: Untreated blank walls visible from public streets, sidewalks, or interior pedestrian pathways are prohibited. A wall (including building facades and retaining walls) is considered a blank wall if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) It is a ground floor wall or portion of a ground floor wall over six feet in height, has a horizontal length greater than 15 feet, and does not include a window, door, building modulation or other architectural detailing; or (b) Any portion of a ground floor wall having a surface area of 400 square feet or greater and does not include a window, door, building modulation or other architectural detailing. <p><u><i>Staff Comment:</i></u> See staff comment Section A.2. "Building Location and Orientation" above.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Minimum Standard: Where blank walls are required or unavoidable, blank walls shall be treated with one or more of the following (see illustration, subsection RMC 4-3-100.15d):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) A planting bed at least five feet in width containing trees, shrubs, evergreen ground cover, or vines adjacent to the blank wall; (b) Trellis or other vine supports with evergreen climbing vines; (c) Architectural detailing such as reveals, contrasting materials, or other special detailing that meets the intent of this standard; (d) Artwork, such as bas-relief sculpture, mural, or similar; or (e) Seating area with special paving and seasonal planting. 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Minimum Standard: Treatment of blank walls shall be proportional to the wall.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Minimum Standard: Provide human-scaled elements such as a lighting fixture, trellis, or other landscape feature along the facade's ground floor.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Minimum Standard: Facades on designated pedestrian-oriented streets shall have at least 75 percent of the linear frontage of the ground floor facade (as measured on a true elevation facing the designated pedestrian-oriented street) comprised of transparent windows and/or doors.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Minimum Standard: Other facade window requirements include the following:</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Building facades must have clear windows with visibility into and out of the building. However, screening may be applied to provide shade and energy efficiency. The minimum amount of light transmittance for windows shall be 50 percent. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

(b) Display windows shall be designed for frequent change of merchandise, rather than permanent displays.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(c) Where windows or storefronts occur, they must principally contain clear glazing.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(d) Tinted and dark glass, highly reflective (mirror-type) glass and film are prohibited.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Guideline: The primary building entrance should be made visibly prominent by incorporating a minimum of one of the following architectural features from each category listed (see illustration, subsection RMC 4-3-100.15e): (a) Facade Features: (1) Recess; (2) Overhang; (3) Canopy; (4) Trellis; (5) Portico; (6) Porch; (7) Clerestory. (b) Doorway Features: (1) Transom windows; (2) Glass windows flanking door; (3) Large entry doors; (4) Ornamental lighting; (5) Lighted displays. (c) Detail Features: (1) Decorative entry paving; (2) Ornamental building name and address; (3) Planted containers; (4) Street furniture (benches, etc.).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Guideline: Artwork or building ornamentation (such as mosaics, murals, grillwork, sculptures, relief, etc.) should be used to provide ground-level detail. <i>Staff Comment: The applicant is highly encouraged to provide any and/or all of the items listed above in order to ornament the ground level of the proposed structure.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Guideline: Elevated or terraced planting beds between the walkway and long building walls are encouraged.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Building Roof Lines: Intent: To ensure that roof forms provide distinctive profiles and interest consistent with an urban project and contribute to the visual continuity of the district.				
Minimum Standard: Buildings shall use at least one of the following elements to create varied and interesting roof profiles (see illustration, subsection RMC 4-3-100.15f): (a) Extended parapets;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

(b) Feature elements projecting above parapets; (c) Projected cornices; (d) Pitched or sloped roofs.				
Minimum Standard: Locate and screen roof-mounted mechanical equipment so that the equipment is not visible within 150 feet of the structure when viewed from ground level.	☒	☐	☐	☐
Minimum Standard: Screening features shall blend with the architectural character of the building, consistent with RMC 4-4-095E , Roof-Top Equipment.	☒	☐	☐	☐
Minimum Standard: Match color of roof-mounted mechanical equipment to color of exposed portions of the roof to minimize visual impacts when equipment is visible from higher elevations.	☒	☐	☐	☐
Guideline: Building roof lines should be varied to add visual interest to the building	☒	☐	☐	☐
4. Building Materials:				
Intent: To ensure high standards of quality and effective maintenance over time; encourage the use of materials that reduce the visual bulk of large buildings; and encourage the use of materials that add visual interest to the neighborhood.				
Minimum Standard: All sides of buildings visible from a street, pathway, parking area, or open space shall be finished on all sides with the same building materials, detailing, and color scheme, or if different, with materials of the same quality.	☒	☐	☐	☐
Minimum Standard: Materials, individually or in combination, shall have an attractive texture, pattern, and quality of detailing for all visible facades.	☒	☐	☐	☐
Minimum Standard: Materials shall be durable, high quality, and reasonably maintained.	☒	☐	☐	☐
Minimum Standard: Buildings shall employ material variations such as colors, brick or metal banding, patterns, or textural changes.	☒	☐	☐	☐
Guideline: Building materials should be attractive, durable, and consistent with more traditional urban development. Appropriate examples would include brick, integrally colored concrete masonry, pre-finished metal, stone, steel, glass, and cast-in-place concrete.	☒	☐	☐	☐
Guideline: Concrete walls should be enhanced by texturing, reveals, snap-tie patterns, coloring with a concrete coating or admixture, or by incorporating embossed or sculpted surfaces, mosaics, or artwork.	☐	☐	☒	☐
Guideline: Concrete block walls should be enhanced with integral color, textured blocks and colored mortar, decorative bond pattern and/or incorporate other masonry materials.	☐	☐	☒	☐
Guideline: Stucco and similar troweled finishes should be used in combination with other more highly textured finishes or accents. They should not be used at the base of buildings between the finished floor elevation and four feet (4') above.	☒	☐	☐	☐
F. SIGNAGE:	M	N	P	N

	M	M	A
Intent: To provide a means of identifying and advertising businesses; provide directional assistance; encourage signs that are both clear and of appropriate scale for the project; encourage quality signage that contributes to the character of the Urban Center and the Center Village; and create color and interest.			
Minimum Standard: Signage shall be an integral part of the design approach to the building.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: Corporate logos and signs shall be sized appropriately for their location. <i>Staff Comment:</i> At this time the applicant has not submitted a detailed sign design as such, staff cannot determine compliance with this standard. At the time of sign permit approval staff will review for this design standard.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: Prohibited signs include (see illustration, subsection RMC 4-3-100.J3a): i. Pole signs; ii. Roof signs; iii. Back-lit signs with letters or graphics on a plastic sheet (can signs or illuminated cabinet signs). Exceptions: Back-lit logo signs less than ten (10) square feet are permitted as are signs with only the individual letters back-lit. (see staff comment above)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: In mixed use and multi-use buildings, signage shall be coordinated with the overall building design. (see staff comment above)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: Freestanding ground-related monument signs, with the exception of primary entry signs, shall be limited to five feet above finished grade, including support structure. All such signs shall include decorative landscaping (ground cover and/or shrubs) to provide seasonal interest in the area surrounding the sign. Alternately, signage may incorporate stone, brick, or other decorative materials as approved by the Director. (see staff comment above)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: Entry signs shall be limited to the name of the larger development. (see staff comment above)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Guideline: Alteration of trademarks notwithstanding, corporate signage should not be garish in color nor overly lit, although creative design, strong accent colors, and interesting surface materials and lighting techniques are encouraged. (see staff comment above)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Guideline: Front-lit, ground-mounted monument signs are the preferred type of freestanding sign. (see staff comment above)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Guideline: Blade type signs, proportional to the building facade on which they are mounted, are encouraged on pedestrian-oriented streets. <i>(see staff comment above)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G. LIGHTING:	M	N	P	N
Intent: To ensure safety and security; provide adequate lighting levels in pedestrian areas such as plazas, pedestrian walkways, parking areas, building entries, and other public places; and increase the visual attractiveness of the area at all times of the day and night.	M	M	M	A
Minimum Standard: <u>Lighting shall conform to on-site exterior lighting regulations located in RMC 4-4-075, Lighting, Exterior On-Site.</u> <i>Staff Comment:</i> Staff recommended, as a condition of Approval, the applicant be required to provide a lighting plan that adequately provides for public safety without casting excessive glare on adjacent properties at the time of building permit review. Pedestrian scale and downlighting shall be used in all cases to assure safe pedestrian and vehicular movement, unless alternative pedestrian scale lighting has been approved administratively or is specifically listed as exempt from provisions located in RMC 4-4-075 Lighting, Exterior On-Site.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: Lighting shall be provided on-site to increase security, but shall not be allowed to directly project off-site. <i>Staff Comment:</i> See Condition above	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Minimum Standard: Pedestrian-scale lighting shall be provided, for both safety and aesthetics, along all streets, at primary and secondary building entrances, at building facades, and at pedestrian-oriented spaces. <i>Staff Comment:</i> See Condition above	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Guideline: Accent lighting should be provided at focal points such as gateways, public art, and significant landscape features such as specimen trees.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Guideline: Additional lighting to provide interest in the pedestrian environment may include sconces on building facades, awnings with down-lighting, decorative street lighting, etc.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>